

AMERICA

A CATHOLIC REVIEW OF THE WEEK

VOL. XXV. No. 10 }
WHOLE No. 613 }

June 25, 1921

{ \$4.00 A YEAR
PRICE 10 CENTS }

CONTENTS

	PAGE
CHRONICLE	217-220
TOPICS OF INTEREST	
Baltimore, the Premier See—The American Catholic Student—American Intervention in Mexico—A First Communion Hymn—Press Comment and Public Opinion.....	221-229
COMMUNICATIONS	229-231
EDITORIALS	
The Congressman and His Oath—Free Speech in Haiti—The Language of the Educated—Protestantism's Roots and Tendencies—"Distinguished Converts"	232-234
LITERATURE	
Antonio Vieira, the "Portuguese Chrysostom"—To a Newly Ordained Priest—Reviews—Books and Authors	235-239
EDUCATION	
Tommy's Foolish Parents	239
SOCIOLOGY	
End of Dramatic Lock-out in Clothing Trade.....	240-241
NOTE AND COMMENT	241-242

Chronicle

Home News.—The resolution declaring the existence of a state of peace between the United States on the one hand and Germany and the former Austro-Hungarian monarchy on the other was passed in the House on June 13 by a vote of 305 to 61. Forty-nine Democrats voted for the resolution and one Republican voted against it. In spite of the fact that the Senate passed a similar resolution many weeks ago, and that there is an overwhelming majority in both houses in favor of such a measure, there is, apparently, no immediate prospect of the two branches of legislature reaching an agreement. The Senate insists that the resolution introduced by Senator Knox shall be the one that goes to the President, whereas the House is equally firm in maintaining that peace shall be declared only in the form introduced by Representative Porter. The difference between the two forms consists in the fact that the Senate resolution contains an explicit repeal of the declaration of war, whereas the House measure merely declares a state of peace. The bill was sent to conference after the Senate had refused to accept the House draft. The difficulty about reaching

an agreement is further increased by the reluctance of Senator Hitchcock, the Senate minority conferee to accept either resolution, although he finds less reason for objection in the Porter resolution than in that drawn up by Senator Knox.

Another matter on which the Senate and House are in disagreement is the Naval Appropriation bill. In the bill as introduced and passed by the House the sum of \$396,000,000 was deemed sufficient for the expenses of the navy during the coming fiscal year. The Senate added \$98,000,000 to this amount. One of the items of additional expense, namely, \$40,000,000, is due to the fact that, whereas the House stipulates that the personnel of the navy shall not be higher than 100,000 men, the Senate believes that the personnel at its minimum should not be less than 120,000 men. The bill was sent to conference more than two weeks ago, but up to the present has been delayed by a deadlock over the question of economy. Perhaps the recommendation of Secretary of the Navy Denby, made in a letter to Senator Poindexter on June 17, may ease the way to concessions. Mr. Denby declared that in his opinion the proper administration of the navy called for not less than 120,000 enlisted men and that this feature, to his mind, was one of the most important in the naval bill. The situation is further complicated by the disarmament resolutions attached to the bill by Representative Porter and Senator Borah. The House leaders, however, are disposed to detach the Porter disarmament resolution from the naval bill and to pass it as a separate measure. The desire to hasten the passage of disarmament legislation is emphasized by the suggestion made in the House of Commons that a conference should be held, at which Great Britain and Japan would meet the United States and discuss plans for reaching a common understanding on the limitation of the present competition in armament.

No move has been made by the Mexican Government to meet the suggestions of Secretary Hughes on the matter of the treaty of amity and commerce. The prevailing popular opinion in Mexico seems to indorse the views with which President Obregon is generally credited, namely, that it is the act of a friendly Government to recognize Mexico without the conditions laid down by the United States. The Chamber of Deputies, sitting at

Mexico City, devoted several hours to a desultory discussion of the ambiguous Article 27 of the Constitution, but apparently took little interest in the matter and the debate drifted off into other subjects without any decisive step having been taken. A new element of disquiet as to the intentions of Mexico has been added to the previous state of uneasiness by the recent executive decree issued by President Obregon, which increases, by twenty-five per cent, the tax on all exports of oil and its derivatives. This decree is declared by American oil men, who have made a formal protest to Secretary Hughes, to be unconstitutional. They allege that the decree violates international law in that the increased taxation is so excessive as to be practically confiscatory. It also violates, according to the American oil men, the Mexican laws, because no decree issued under the so-called extraordinary powers of the Executive can be invoked unless it has received the authorization either of Congress or, in case Congress is not in session, of the Standing Committee of Congress. The requisite authorization, they point out, has been received from neither source.

It was announced on June 15 that conversations have begun between Secretary Hughes and Baron Shidehara, the Japanese Ambassador to Washington, with a view to

American-Japanese Conference

reaching a settlement on matters in dispute between the United States and Japan. The points of discussion, among others, are the California question, the attitude of Japan with regard to Siberia, the return of Shantung to China and the status of the Island of Yap. The discussion is only a continuance of parleys already in progress under the previous Administration and has for its purpose to cement relations of friendship without appeal to outside agencies. Should the outcome be in accord with present expectations, the way will be paved for eliminating from international relations some of the embarrassment caused by Secretary Hughes' note to the great Powers on the question of the mandate to Japan. In his communication Mr. Hughes insisted that the consent of this country was essential to any valid disposition of the former German overseas possessions, and that the mandate given to Japan was without validity. Both France and Italy replied to the note and declared their assent to the principle enunciated by the Secretary of State, but Great Britain and Japan sent no reply. Japan has declared her willingness to accept the internationalization of the cables located at Yap, but declines to relinquish her mandate over the island itself. The question was to have been brought up by France before the Council of the League of Nations, which opened its session at Geneva on June 16, but it is taken for granted that any solution reached directly by the two nations concerned would have the approval of the Council.

Egypt.—On the evening of May 22 a reign of terror broke out in Alexandria. Attempts were made to enter

foreign residences and set fire to European houses in various quarters of the city. Considerable fighting ensued. Owing to the indiscriminate shooting in the streets

Reign of Terror in Alexandria

a number of fires occurred, and looting of shops took place. Disturbances were first promoted by gangs who assaulted Europeans. The seriousness of the situation, however, developed when the Greeks fired recklessly from their houses, shooting in their excitement even at the Egyptian police. Considerable numbers of foreigners fled to the Governorate, where the Greek and Italian Consuls made protests. The call was finally sent by the Governor for British troops, who took over the city. Their appearance calmed the disturbances. Thirty-seven were killed in the fighting, of whom twelve were Europeans, and the number of wounded was 151, among them sixty Europeans. The correspondent of the *London Times* regards the event as a planned proceeding. Four of the Egyptian wounded died in a hospital and were buried by the Public Health authorities without identification. The following morning the bodies were dug out by the people and a great funeral was given them. They were proclaimed "Victims of liberty." On their return, according to a Reuter report, the masses again poured through the street shouting: "We are not afraid of bullets! Down with Adly! Down with Rushdy! Long live Zaghlul!" The Zaghlulist newspapers had predicted grave events, and the foreign communities continue to be most apprehensive.

Ireland.—The correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian*, writing from Belfast on the day of the Ulster elections for the Parliament of Northern Ireland, which

Views on Carsonia

resulted in an unexpectedly large majority for the Unionists, declares that the elections were unparalleled in Irish politics for ruthlessness, corruption and unfairness:

It would be hard to find even in the rather corrupt history of Irish politics an election fought with such ruthlessness, such corruption and such unfairness as the election for the Northern Parliament which ended today. The result was never in doubt. The Unionist majority will be ample to enable the new Parliament to form its quorum and to constitute a Government and a Senate. That was all the more reason why consideration of fair play might have operated, and a party that took its stand on "liberty and freedom" and made the Union Jack its election symbol might have given its opponents the same opportunity of exercising their opinions through the ballot-box that is granted in most democratic countries. Instead the Unionists converted the election into a fair imitation of what one supposes the Silesian plebiscite to have been like.

The correspondent goes on to give details of the violence and intimidation to which those not in favor with the Unionists were subjected. Nationalists on their way to vote were "roughly handled, beaten, and kicked." Sinn Fein personating agents were forcibly ejected from the voting booths, "because of their objection to Unionist agents helping people to vote, standing over them and even guiding the pencil."

At Dumbo two personating agents were ejected early in the day by the police, in spite of the fact that their credentials were in order and their action proper. That booth is now in the hands of the Unionists, who will be able to poll the whole register—dead, absent, Nationalist, Sinn Fein, all will have their papers registered in the approved manner.

After stating that incidents like the foregoing could be extended indefinitely, the correspondent sums up the situation as follows:

The result is that they terrorize the Catholic voter, and he stops away rather than run the gauntlet of the hostile crowd round the booths. But if he stays away his vote is not only lost to the Anti-Partitionists, but given to the Unionists, because they personate him.

Mr. Joseph Devlin, M.P., is quoted as having said that he had never known an election more brazenly corrupt:

Not only have we lost hundreds of votes by intimidation, but the Unionists have personated our voters and thus gained two for every man and woman they kept away. Ulster volunteers, armed, were inside every booth and at the doors. Wherever we were strong there were military and police along with the volunteer specials. Wherever we were weak there was nobody to protect our voters but the Unionist specials. Personating was common and organized.

In contrast with the conduct of the Unionists, the correspondent declares that he heard no complaint of intimidation or interference with Unionist voters by Sinn Feiners or Nationalists in their strongest districts of Belfast.

The New York *Freeman*, writing in much the same sense, scoffs at the inspired press utterances which emphasize the "the remarkable victory of the 'loyalists,'" and declares that it is well known that the electoral results were made a foregone conclusion, owing to the fact that the province had been delimited in such a way as "to prevent any possibility of the Nationalist majority which a straight election would have undoubtedly produced." Even on the basis of proportional representation, remarks the *Freeman*, which was introduced to prejudice all not favorable to the oligarchy at Belfast, the Nationalists, on any fair estimate of voting power, should have received at least twenty out of the fifty-two allotted seats. Lloyd George's action in the North and South of Ireland is set in sharp contrast by the *Freeman*:

It is an appropriate commentary upon the political morality now current in England that Mr. Lloyd George can invoke the right of self-determination for a political faction in Belfast, while his agents carry on like bashi-bazouks all over the rest of Ireland, because national opinion there has registered itself in favor of autonomy, by the election of 124 Sinn Fein members out of a total of 128. The British Government is making great play with the "loyalist" majority in Ulster, but the Nationalist majority in the South seems to be regarded merely as a further justification of terrorism and coercion.

The past week in Ireland has been marked by great disorder and many deaths. In evidence of liberty, equal-

ity and fraternity, British cavalry has been sweeping North-East Ulster clear of all whose opinions do not agree with those of Carson and Craig. As if to add to the difficulty of the problem, Generals Macready and Strickland have announced that no American relief shall go to dependents of men of the Irish Republican Army in the field, "on the run," in jail or interned. In other words, practically, nobody, except Unionists, will be relieved. A letter from a traveler speaks as follows of existing conditions:

Death and Disorder

In England, the long-continued coal strike and the attempted destruction of plants using or converting coal such as gas works, etc., are causing much restlessness and disorder. On May 15 the London papers described all these outrages as "Sinn Fein reprisals in London" and this was followed by a bloody week of slaughter in Ireland, beginning the following day.

Every well-known Sinn Feiner in London is being arrested and deported to Irish internment camps and prisons as punishment for these London crimes, although none have been tried and no shadow of proof connects them with any crime, according to Scotland Yard admissions.

While in Dublin common report, and the daily papers, described from day to day various deaths due to the Black and Tans, yet when I returned to London I found the London papers listing these deaths as due to "Sinn Fein ambushes." Then on last Sunday (May 22) there was a fresh outbreak of destruction in London, all of which was, without proof, charged to the Irish: this is to my mind all part of a carefully arranged plan to rouse the anger of the English masses and to secure their approval of the Irish slaughter that is to follow, also to influence public opinion in the U. S. A. One of the officers of the United States Mail S. S. Co. told me that the newly-advertised call of their boats at Queenstown (on the westward journey only) was to care for a very heavy Irish emigration. It is my deliberate judgment that the only solution of the Irish question that Lloyd George really plans is first a massacre of the Irish leaders, then such an intensified reign of terror and destruction that the rank and file will be forced to emigrate: even last week the London papers were hinting at more drastic measure for Ireland.

You might imagine from the above that my visit to Dublin was depressing but on the contrary it was the most inspiring experience of my life: as inspiring as a visit to Rome in the days of Nero or Diocletian. I met people on every hand cheerfully and placidly prepared to go to death: the high courage that seems so marvelous to the onlooker may be explained by the fact that in one church 364,000 Communions were distributed last year: something so mysterious to the Black and Tans that they surround the church, school and rectory with barbed wire entanglements!

Meantime Britain is pouring more troops into Ireland to promote democracy.

Rome.—Three Italian Cardinals were added to the Sacred College on June 13 when the Holy Father in a secret consistory raised to the purple Mgr. Giovanni Tacci Porcelli, the Papal Major-domo; Mgr. Camillo Laurenti, Secretary to the Congregation of the Propaganda, and Mgr. Achille Ratti, Papal Nuncio to Poland. According to the reports cabled to the metropolitan dailies by the Associated press, not yet officially con-

The Pope and Palestine

firmed, the Pope's allocution delivered before the consistory expressed deep anxiety over the situation in Palestine, owing to the activities of the Jews in the Holy Land, "and urged the Governments of the Christian nations to appeal to the League of Nations to insist upon the definition of the British mandate in Palestine." The allocution, according to dispatches quoted in the *New York Times*, charged that the Jews were "taking advantage of the sufferings of the inhabitants due to the war" and deplored "the privileged position enjoyed by the Jews in Palestine, which is dangerous for Christians." The Holy Father added that in spite of his limited means and of the calls upon his charity, he would not fail to come to the help of the sufferers. Fully aware that all national and political disputes in Europe were not yet closed, he implored all those in power to settle the outstanding controversies in a spirit of justice and charity. He expressed his joy at the restoration of diplomatic relations with France. In renewing them the Holy See had but one intention, that of fostering harmony between the Church and State for the common good. The secret consistory of June 13 was followed by a public consistory on June 16, at which the insignia of the Cardinalate were conferred on Mgr. Ragonesi, former Nuncio to Spain; Juan Benlloch y Vivo, Archbishop of Burgos, and Mgr. Francisco Vidal y Barraquer, Archbishop of Tarragona, who were created Cardinals at the March consistory.

Italy is at last speaking approvingly of diplomatic relations with the Holy See. The question is now favorably discussed in many of the Italian journals, some of them

formerly hostile to Catholicism and the Holy See. According to the Masonic organ, the *Messaggero*, there

is more than a possibility that the "Italian question," as the problem of the relations between the Vatican and the Royal Italian Government is called, may be reopened. The occasion, perhaps even the immediate cause of the revival of interest in the question, was the solemn reception granted by the Holy Father to Mr. Jonnart, recently appointed French Ambassador to the Holy See. According to the *Messaggero*, the renewal of diplomatic relations with France is the greatest event in the Pontificate of Benedict XV. All nations, the *Messaggero* says, except the United States, are represented at the Vatican. Even Great Britain has not recalled the special representative sent to the Vatican for the exceptional period of the war. "One country alone," it adds, "namely, Italy, which has equally important interests to defend abroad, especially in the East, is absent."

The possibility of some regular relations between the Holy See and the Italian Government was indicated in 1920 by the publication of the Papal Encyclical in which the Holy Father revoked some of the conditions which made it impossible for Catholic sovereigns to visit Rome. At that time it was stated from reliable though unofficial sources that a Concordat between the Vatican and the

Quirinal was only a matter of a short time. The *Corriere d'Italia*, which generally represents the views of the Popular party, sees in the comment of the *Messaggero* the failure of the theories which led Baron Sonnino to insert Article 15 in the Treaty of London, which expressly excluded the Holy Father from any share in the peace settlement to be made after the war. Men are everywhere beginning to realize, irrespective of creed, whether anti-clericals in France and Italy, Soviets in Russia, Lutherans or Anglicans in Germany and England, that recognition of the successor of Peter, the spiritual head of more than three hundred million Catholics, is necessary for the peace of the world. *Il Tempo* views without alarm and with something like gratitude the possible renewal of diplomatic intercourse between Pope and King. In a long article entitled, "*Verso la Sistemazione dei Rapporti fra Chiesa e Stato?*" it quotes with evident approval the words of Guglielmo Quadrotta, a writer of usually anti-clerical tendencies, who writes substantially as follows: Undoubtedly there is a new "orientation" in the thought and opinion of the multitudes. They are beginning to study the relations of Church and State without passion and without prejudice, and to view them apart from passing political interests. The present historical moment is favorable for the solution of a problem which for the last half century has been a heavy handicap for Italy, one fraught with weightier consequences than the superficial observer is apt to discover. The Vatican has created new nunciatures and apostolic delegations at Berlin, Kiev, Prague, Bucharest, Budapest, Belgrade, Warsaw, Fiume. It sees the renewals of diplomatic relations with France and England, and does not reject overtures with the Soviets of Russia in order to safeguard Catholicism in the East. Italy cannot reject such a similar "rapprochement" with the Holy See. For that purpose it has in itself all the traditional and actual elements needed. It must not neglect the opportunity. It must use it in a manner that will be a pattern for the whole world, and in a way that will strengthen and stabilize our national life. Coming from *Il Tempo* and such a well-known anti-clerical as Quadrotta this is significant.

While not inattentive to the higher aspects of the renewal of diplomatic relations between the Quirinal and the Vatican, *Il Tempo* does not remain indifferent to the utilitarian side of the problem. In fact, it sees in the renewal of the same relations between France and the Holy Father a proof that these more material views have to a certain extent prevailed. As far as the French Republic is concerned this is undoubtedly true. The coming of a French ambassador to the Vatican can bring little material advantage to the Pope; and it is generally recognized even by opponents that in the reopening of the whole question with France, the Holy Father looked to the good of souls and to the increased facilities given him by the presence of an envoy of the French Republic to work for that end both in France itself and in the French colonies or spheres of influence. The same is to be said for Italy.

Baltimore, the Premier See

M. B. DOWNING

A MERICAN chroniclers are prone to employ resounding phrases, even though they be misleading. Few who allude to the archdiocese of Baltimore, now awaiting the appointment of its tenth chief shepherd, fail to employ the familiar designation, "the primatial see." Primatial in every accepted derivation pertains to a Primate, and no such exalted ecclesiastic has ever presided over Baltimore or any other province of the United States. The word cannot be twisted into meaning the premier see, which is unmistakably what the writers intend to convey, or, more precisely stated, the first diocese created in the English-speaking colonies of the United States. The Archbishop of Baltimore holds exalted honors among the heads of metropolitan provinces by virtue of the seniority of his episcopal seat. The small State of Delaware claims precedence over all other commonwealths when they are represented by their governors, for the same reason. Delaware accepted the Constitution and ratified it before any of the others, therefore it is the premier State. In councils of governors, her executive presides; in grand parades of the militia of States, her troops lead. The Governor of Delaware possesses no authority beyond the limits of his territory, and this, too, divides the jurisdiction of a Primate from that of an Archbishop, even of a premier see. The latter actually rules in his own See only, though he is granted the highest honor in the assemblage of his brethren.

Baltimore as the premier see is a study of peculiar interest at this time, when the successor of one of its most eminent native sons is looked for with eager anticipation. Of the nine prelates who have guided its destiny, in the 131 years since its creation, four were native Marylanders, and a fifth, the Most Reverend Martin John Spalding, was born in the first generation of Marylanders domiciled in Kentucky. The lamented Cardinal Gibbons was unique in the annals in that he was the only wearer of the purple and the only incumbent born in Baltimore. In the appointment of two native Marylanders, as the first and second Archbishops is found the key of an important historical situation.

The surrender of Cornwallis to the allied armies under Washington and Rochambeau ushered in a period of social and political chaos in which the religious and moral forces of the colonies were vitally involved. Father John Lewis, Superior of the Missions during the revolutionary struggle, found himself on an uncharted sea. He requested of the Roman authorities some definite instructions, now that the triumph of the Continentals had completely severed his hitherto slender connection with the Apostolic Vicar of London. Benjamin Franklin was in Paris with other illustrious Americans, as a signatory of the treaty which made peace between Great Britain and

the thirteen States, and to him the Apostolic Nuncio, Cardinal Doria, who was a friend and admirer of the patriot and philosopher, addressed an important query as to the relations to be maintained between Church and State under the new dispensation. This document, dated July 28, 1783, may be found in Jared Sparks' monumental works on the life, essays and general papers of Benjamin Franklin, (vol. 8, p. 548). It relates succinctly the situation created by the independence of the Colonies, stresses the isolation of Catholics, and mentions that unless provision be made for them at home they will be compelled to journey to foreign lands to receive Confirmation and Holy Orders. Cardinal Doria then requests Dr. Franklin to forward this petition of the Holy See to the Congress and to support it with his credit:

It is essential that the Catholic subjects of the United States should have an ecclesiastic to govern them in their religious concerns. The Congregation of De Propaganda Fide in Rome existing for the establishment and conservation of missions has reached the determination of proposing to Congress to establish in some city of the United States of North America, one of its Catholic subjects with the power of Apostolic Vicar, and in the character of Bishop or simply in the quality of Apostolic Prefect. The establishment of an Apostolic Vicar-Bishop appears to be the most eligible (*sic*) . . . And so as it might sometimes happen, that among the subjects of the United States, there might be no person in a situation to be charged with the spiritual government, either as Bishop or Apostolic Prefect, it would be necessary under such circumstances that Congress should consent to choose him from among the subjects of a foreign nation friendly to the United States.

Franklin threw himself precipitately into the task assigned, for his Americanism was of the rugged sort which feared all extraneous influence on the formative character of the infant State. He enthusiastically endorsed the selection of the Rev. John Carroll of Rock Creek, Maryland, already well known for the virile and substantial virtues needed at the time, and he quite as cordially promoted the interests of Philadelphia as this first American see. Two years later this entertaining entry may be read in Dr. Franklin's Memoirs:

July 1. (1785). The Pope's Nuncio (Cardinal Doria of the Papal note to Congress) has called and acquainted me that the Pope, had on my recommendation appointed Mr. John Carroll, superior of the Catholic clergy in America, with many of the powers of a Bishop and that probably before the year was out, he would be made a Bishop *in partibus*. He asked me which would be more convenient for him, to come to France or to go to Santo Domingo for ordination by another Bishop, which was necessary. I mentioned Quebec as more convenient than either. He then asked, as that was an English province, if our Government might not take offense at his going thither? I thought not, unless the ordination by that Bishop might give him some authority over our Bishop. He said not in the least, that once our Bishop was ordained, he would be entirely independent of the others, even of the Pope, which I did not clearly understand.

Apparently the versatile Franklin, friend and associate of learned abbés, Cardinals and Bishops did not grasp the significance of the episcopal dignity and its unassailable loyalty to the Holy See.

But Dr. Franklin is clearly impressed by the honor of a Bishop in the new Republic. By "our" Bishop, he means not only the American prelate but the Bishop of Philadelphia. Such, too, seemed to have been the preconceived idea of the Pontiff, Pius VI, who created the see. Philadelphia was the chief city and the capital of the United States, and though New York, after its evacuation by the British, swept into place as a serious rival in the commercial way, its Catholic population was negligible in both city and State, while Pennsylvania had the largest group, after Maryland. Baltimore in 1790 was a small port, less than Annapolis or Norfolk, and entirely out of competition with the two other cities struggling to become the permanent seat of government.

Benjamin Franklin's busy life had ended a few months before the priests of the United States met in White-marsh for the dual purpose of balloting for their Bishop and naming the episcopal see. He would no doubt have been grievously disappointed that the choice fell on Baltimore. But logically it could have been none other than the chief city of the heroic province whose sons and daughters had kept alive the Faith during the dark days when help could come only from within. But the influence of Franklin during his intimate conferences with Cardinal Doria was paramount in the selection of Bishop Carroll first Bishop and Archbishop of Baltimore, and likewise in the choice of Leonard Neale, the second Bishop. Both came from pioneers in the Catholic palatinate, who had wrought well both for Church and State. Franklin, a shrewd philosopher, forcibly portrayed the results which would ensue from honoring men who bore representative names and who possessed in addition the requisite traits of character. The sturdy American's counsels were heeded, and the Roman Curia could not resist being affected by the clarity with which this non-Catholic had interpreted the feeling and opinions of the Catholic colonists and their priesthood. Alone among the first sees created, Baltimore received native sons as the first and second of its prelates. When in 1808, four additional sees were created, it is of consuming interest, that all four Bishops were from France and Ireland, countries friendly to the United States, but were not of American birth, nor in one case at least of naturalized citizenship.

Of the four Maryland Archbishops of the premier see, two, John Carroll and Leonard Neale, were of Catholic colonial descent, while the third, Samuel Eccleston, was of a Protestant cavalier family, who had become a convert to the Faith. Archbishop Carroll's life and achievements have been worthily preserved in many erudite volumes, but the fame of the Neales which begins with the opening chapter of Lord Baltimore's experiment in religious and civil liberty, has never been adequately re-

corded. The name Neale always invites the hope that some diligent historian will do for this admirable family what the Very Reverend Father O'Daniel has recently accomplished for the Fenwicks. An Archbishop of Baltimore, who may be called a grandson of Maryland, Martin John Spalding, was a descendant of that colony of loyal Catholics who settled in 1638 in St. Mary's County. Lancasters, Boones, Fenwicks and Hamiltons all intermarried and are thus related. One other prelate of the premier see, was an American, James Roosevelt Bailey of New York. Three aliens make up the list, Mareschal of France, Whitfield of England and the brilliant Irish prelate, Kenrick.

The American Catholic Student

FLOYD KEELER

YOUTH is proverbially ready to do and to dare. Age, with its experiences of failure and its knowledge of the reverses, is inclined to conservatism, and shakes its head dubiously over the schemes of the rising generation. It is well that we have both, for if the impetuosity of youth were unrestrained we would often be entrapped by hidden pitfalls, and if conservatism were allowed to reign supreme it would tend to ossify all human thought and activity. And never was there greater need for the admixture than at the present time, A new world has come into being within the past decade, things which previously were taken for granted have not only been questioned but in very many questions have been proved worthless and been discarded. Latent abilities and powers unknown and untested have come to the fore and have been utilized for the greater glory of God and the advancement of His Kingdom. The new spirit which has come into being among our American Catholic students is an example of this.

Our Catholic educational system, that thing for which our fathers generously gave, in many cases of their penury, that it might be, has come down to us, not as an inferior or negligible thing, but as a mighty organization spreading into every part of the land and caring for the intellectual needs of our youth from earliest infancy through the highest university and professional courses. There is today practically no branch of knowledge which cannot be acquired in the midst of Catholic surroundings. And with this expansion of the system has come a new sense of solidarity and an increasing readiness on the part of our youth to reach out into new fields.

The Catholic student believes in his religion. He may not exhibit a great deal of outward piety, he may at times seem to be rather careless as to religious observances, but if one will compare him, not with the highest ideals of Catholic perfection, but with his non-Catholic fellow-student he will measure up to a remarkably high standard. Because he is an American, "to believe" is to him a synonym of "to do," and he is ready to translate that belief into action.

There have been and are Catholic student organizations in various parts of the world. Almost every European country has them, and the writer, who is probably in as close touch with these as anyone in this country, has been led in the course of his correspondence to find much that is admirable in them. But if a criticism may be allowed, there seems to be a lack in them from the American point of view and that lack is not in their omission of anything, but in the direction of overdoing. Most of them seem to have a program which is too ambitious for us, and because of its very extent, too much subject to possible failure. We Americans cannot stand that. "Seeing it through" is an American habit, and we would rather not start than not finish, and finish first.

The European student movements are divided into various departmental groups. They comprehend not only missionary effort, but also aim to take a part in scientific, educational, and even political activities. It is this that has prevented a whole-hearted response on the part of our American students to the various invitations for participation in the European plans. Whatever may be the need in Europe, American Catholics have no need and no desire to constitute a political party or to take a part in politics as a body. As American citizens we do have our political affiliations and interests, but we do not aim to be separate from our non-Catholic brethren in them. Incomprehensible as it seems to be to the average European, we know how to live in peace and harmony with our neighbors and without compromising our Faith in any way we are able to do so. Our interest as Catholics lies only in the up-building of the Church and the spread of our Holy Faith, both at home and abroad. There is very little

need for an American Catholic student organization in any other directions and the Catholic Students' Mission Crusade, which is the only widespread Catholic student organization in North America, keeps its eye single in that direction.

At the Crusade convention in Washington last summer, some semi-political resolutions were introduced by our zealous young men, but acceding to the wisdom of our President, Bishop Shahan, when he pointed out the danger of establishing such a precedent, they were withdrawn. The convention was missionary through and through, and missions were the whole object of its deliberations. But with what enthusiasm did the students debate the things which were designed to foster the spread of their religion! All during those days—yes, and far into the nights—groups of young men and young women could be seen everywhere discussing missionary ways and means. Matters of policy were argued warmly but every decision was reached on the basis of what was best for the delivery of the message to those who knew it not.

It is this new American Catholic student missionary spirit which gives us our hopes for the future. A generation which is as keenly alive as the rising generation is, will put the Church where she belongs in the economy of American life. The Crusade is only three years old, but it has already enrolled 50,000 of our students in its ranks. Its third general convention is to be held at the University of Dayton, Dayton, Ohio, August 18 to 21, and it is expected to be a gathering of prelates, priests, religious educators, young men and young women unique in American Catholic history. To any who are skeptical as to what is the spirit of the American Catholic student, we say, "Come and see."

American Intervention in Mexico

WILLIAM J. A. MALONEY

"THE Catholic Church is back of intervention in Mexico." This assertion steals furtively from Protestant to Protestant, along the whispering galleries of Masonry, acquiring the force of scandal and error which is an essential of dogma in certain anti-Catholic circles. The assertion is both written and spoken, but not yet publicly. It is current in all sects and ranks of Protestant society, clerical and lay. Some who make it are merely credulous scandal-mongers; others are social defectives who revel in malice, destructive children who grow in years and physique, but not in mind; while others again sincerely believe and lament what they assert.

The assertion implies: (a) that intervention in Mexico is blameworthy; (b) that those who make the assertion are free from blame; and (c) that the Catholic Church is irresistibly coercing these Protestant United States to intervention in Mexico.

Sects or factions of sects who disclaim responsibility, and allocate blame, for an intervention which has not yet come to pass, and which they do not apply their power to hinder, are obviously seeking self-justification. Catholics may welcome this stirring of the Protestant conscience, as a sign of grace. To protest innocence, one must shrink from blame. And one must feel the burden of blame before one seeks to shift it to others.

The burden is potentially overpowering. A United States colonel, who has seen service on the Mexican border, recently computed that it would take 500,000 American troops, three years to pacify Mexico. To train, equip, transport and maintain this force would cost the American people at least the national income of a generation. The toll of dead, wounded, blinded, maimed and diseased Americans and Mexicans would, in sorrow and suffering, almost suffice to redeem the world, and in these three years, American trade would disap-

pear from Latin America, and American prestige would sink to the English level. Hence, it is natural that good Protestants should seek to divest themselves of blame for intervention in Mexico. And as they do so in their righteousness as Protestants, they must exculpate their coreligionists, so they blame the Catholics.

Unfortunately, the whispers of the scrupulously righteous are inaudible amidst the clamor of our Protestant friends who consider intervention in Mexico not blameworthy but laudable. Mexico is a Catholic country with a Latin civilization. The people are so illiterate, they do not even speak English. The country is infested by bandits and given over to lawlessness. It must be cleaned up. America must confer upon these benighted Mexicans the blessings of Anglo-Saxon culture, Bibles and baths, base ball and organized bathos.

The race riots in Washington, Chicago, Tulsa and other American cities; the peonage in Georgia; endemic lynching; the labor war in the West Virginia coal fields; the illiteracy of certain sections of the South; the banditry in our large cities; and the graft and corruption in our politics, seem scarcely to justify a fervent faith in the blessings of Anglo-Saxon civilization. Perhaps, here the seed has fallen on stony ground. If it be sown with bayonets in foreign fields, such as Haiti and Mexico, the domestic harvest of tares may shrivel up in the glory of the harvest in the new vineyard.

So the preparations for intervention proceed. These preparations logically end in an incident provocative of intervention. The precise nature of that incident matters little. It can happen overnight. It will serve merely to precipitate intervention in minds saturated to the point of intervention.

Meanwhile the United States Government refuses to recognize the Mexican Government, except under conditions which implicitly surrender in some degree Mexico's sovereign rights. The Mexican people overthrow Mexican Governments which barter Mexico's sovereign rights in exchange for American recognition or support. Diaz, Madero and Carranza sought foreign support in one form or another. The interdependence of modern nations is inescapable. The importation of industrial ambitions requires the importation of industrial capital and experts. The extent to which foreign influence dictated the conduct of the elected representatives of the Mexican people varied in these several regimes. But the greater it was popularly supposed to be the greater was the popular resentment and suspicion of it.

This resentment was not unfounded. Since Mexico freed herself, her history is innocent of a single disinterested service rendered to her by a foreign nation. The United States has warred openly against her twice, has incited Mexicans to rebel, and has appropriated vast areas of Mexican territory. France imposed an emperor upon the Mexican Republic. And England has supported revolutionary bands.

So a Mexican Government which rightly or wrongly

is credited by the Mexican people with subservience to foreign influence, is overthrown by the Mexican people, who insist upon a government of the Mexican people, by the Mexican people, for the Mexican people. And foreigners who through their Government, or through a consortium, require President Obregon to sign agreements infringing Mexico's sovereign rights, are requiring him to sign possibly his own death warrant and certainly the death warrant of his Government. Incidentally, they are provoking another Mexican revolution.

Besides such national revolutions, foreign interests have long kept sporadic revolutions active in certain sections of Mexico. Indeed, foreigners have staged such revolutions, and have imposed embargos on arms, so as to cripple the Mexican Government in dealing with the revolutionaries, thus fostering anarchy and destroying the credit of the Mexican Government abroad.

For over eighty years, foreign interests have been invading Mexico, preying upon her, and when disturbed, invoking violence. Yet, in spite of this long agony Mexico is still a nation, fighting for its national rights. The conditions imposed upon her have bred a horde of generals, who with their followings extort tributes, and exercise sway according to their power. Mexican or foreign interests exalt or depose these generals in succession, as circumstances permit and need demands. But the resulting chronic chaos, although it has perforce abolished peace, arrested progress, banished security, undermined religion, and isolated Mexican communities so as to reduce correlated national effort to a minimum, yet has failed to destroy the national spirit which tenaciously unites the Mexican people. It is this spirit that daunts the cautious among the American interventionists. It will live until the 17,000,000 Mexican people are reduced to impotence or exterminated, which is a task that will employ perhaps 500,000 American troops for three years.

If the statistics of the great war may be taken as a guide, a large proportion of the invading American troops will be Catholics; and the majority of these of Irish blood.

Lowell, in the "Bigelow Papers," graphically summarizes the consequences of Mexican intervention, as follows:

Washington, Sept. 30, 1848.

Rev. Homer Wibur to Uncle Samuel,
To his share of work done in Mexico on partnership
account, sundry jobs, as below:
Killing, maiming and wounding about 5000 Mexicans...\$2.00
Slaughtering one woman carrying water to wounded... .10
Extra work on two different Sabbaths (one bombardment and one assault), whereby the Mexicans were prevented from defiling themselves with the idolatries of high Mass 3.50
Throwing an especially fortunate and Protestant bomb-shell into the Cathedral of Vera Cruz, whereby several female Papists were slain at the altar50
His proportion of cash paid for conquered territory.... 1.75
do. do. for conquering do..... 1.50
Manuring do. with superior compost known as American citizen50

Extending the area of freedom and Protestantism.....	.01
Glory01

\$9.87

Immediate payment is requested.

Intervention implies that Catholic Americans should slay and be slain by Catholic Mexicans; and that Catholic sanctuaries in Mexico shall be razed in the process. Our Protestant friends are innocent of any intent to impute to the Catholic Church a suicidal purpose. A Mexican Catholic is no less and no more precious to the Church than any other Catholic. And Mexico, so far as it is a religious country, is a Catholic country.

The anarchy induced by foreign interests in Mexico, has undermined religion. The Mexican people, formerly an exemplary Catholic people, are now subject to a governmental minority which persecutes the Church. Those Mexicans who have left the Faith, have sought no other. The Protestant community in Mexico, according to Protestant statistics, numbers only 60,000 members, and is served by 175 American missionaries. It is composed partly of foreign employes. As in all other lands, the assault on Catholicism has led not to Protestantism of an enduring kind, but to the disintegration of belief in Christianity. Protestant interests are relatively insignificant in Mexico; and they have not been opposed by the various Mexican Governments which the foreign interests have set up, or supported. Catholics welcome the publication by Protestants of the fact of this immunity: but repel the insinuation contained in this publicity, that the Catholic Church is therefore back of intervention in Mexico.

To support this insinuation, the names of Mr. Edward L. Doheny and of certain other Catholics who are alleged to be interested in intervention are cited. Catholic Haiti is now suffering the evils of a surreptitious American intervention on behalf of the Rockefeller interests, as represented in the National City Bank of New York. Perhaps by an oversight Catholic America has not yet been held to blame for the Haitian adventure. Perhaps also by an oversight, the Protestant press has neither condemned the intervention in Haiti, nor disclaimed responsibility for it. Secretary Hughes is profanely known as the Baptist Pope. The Rockefellers give light and power to that sect. The Rockefeller interests are paramount in Haiti and in Mexico. A denunciation of the Haitian iniquity by our Protestant friends might end the Haitian occupation. But the silence regarding Haiti, must detract from the force of Protestant disclaimers of responsibility for the projected intervention in Mexico.

Mr. Edward L. Doheny is unique among the oil magnates. As a pioneer in Mexico he struggled for long years to gain the prosperity which is now his. Alone among oil magnates he has shared his prosperity with the Mexican people, and has according to his wisdom been solicitous for their welfare. He succored the Mexican Catholics who were driven into exile by their Govern-

ment. To see Mexico devastated by war would break his great generous heart. But he has claims which he considers valid, and he maintains pertinaciously what he holds to be his rights, against the fleeting Governments which other interests control. His claims are scarcely significant in the total of the foreign interests which are invading Mexico. The Doheny claims alone would not lead a single American soldier to the border. And in maintaining his claims, Mr. Doheny acts not in his capacity as a Catholic but as an oil magnate—like Mr. Rockefeller.

Mr. Doheny holds the proud position of President of the American Association for the Recognition of the Irish Republic. The purpose of which association is solely that implied in its title. The members of that association could not passively permit to be created in Mexico what they abhor in Ireland—a nation in chains. They constitute 600,000 units against the making of another Ireland in Mexico. Both as Irish and as Catholic sympathizers they are opposed to intervention.

But there exist undoubtedly certain Catholics who are interventionists, just as there are certain Catholics who uphold England in her brutality in Ireland, and uphold England even to the point of railing at their coreligionists. The lack of charity of such people may be deplored; and their understanding pitied. Yet they may according to their rights be none the less sincere Catholics. And as such they are entitled to toleration in their political opinions. But they no more indicate that the Catholic Church is back of the Black and Tans in Ireland, than that the Catholic Church is back of intervention in Mexico.

In national affairs, the spokesmen of the Catholic Church, are the Bishops, who alone are responsible for the spiritual interests of their Catholic fellow-citizens. No Catholic American Bishop has advocated intervention in Mexico: and no Catholic American Bishop ever will do so, for it is contrary to the interests both of United States and of Mexican Catholics.

The plight of the Catholic Church in Mexico is due to interventionists. Every Mexican Catholic, shares with Catholic nationals everywhere, the duty of upholding legally constituted authority. In the long series of Mexican revolutions, the Church in Mexico has placed upon the Faithful, the obligation of supporting the existing authority. Fulfilment of this obligation, in the event of a successful revolution, leaves the Catholic Mexicans without the support of the deposed Government he upheld, and with the enmity of the superseding Government. And this heritage has been the portion of the Church from Government to Government, since foreign interests have intervened to make and mar governments in Mexico. The intervening interests change but the Church remains, the residuary legatee of a resentment as natural as it is unmerited.

Mainly out of this resentment springs the Mexican persecution of the Church. It is active today. The

Mexican Bishops have recently felt impelled to address the following letter to President Obregon:

We, the undersigned Mexican Prelates, have learned that in official circles it is the belief that the Episcopate is hostile to the Government, is politically active against it, and is attempting, by means of Catholic societies, to obstruct its acts.

We are certain, Mr. President, that without any prejudice whatever you will listen to the statements which we make herein, because we deem them necessary, not only to defend ourselves against calumny, but as well to do our part toward contributing to that concord which should prevail among all Mexicans.

Because we have always proclaimed and sustained that principle which declares illicit all armed rebellion against the established Government, we have been charged with being the partisans of whatever government has been assailed. By our very principles we cannot be hostile to any established government, and we have never departed a hair's breadth from these principles.

It is true that at the time of the promulgation of the Constitution of 1917 the majority of the Mexican Bishops protested against it, because it outlawed unjustly the most fundamental rights of Catholics; their schools; their religion; their acts of worship; their churches and other edifices necessary to the exercise of their religious life. It is also true that we have made very definite statements about the claims which should be made by Catholics against the Government, and which they should continue to make, until they obtain that real religious liberty which is their right. Finally it is true that we have published pastoral letters and other documents in defense of the Catholic Faith against the propaganda of Protestants, Socialists, and Bolsheviki, but this, we do not believe, can be called opposition to the Government, granted that Catholics have the right to be instructed in all that they should do to defend their rights and preserve their faith and morals.

We believe that Catholics might with justice protest against any government declaring itself a propagandist of theories that are openly repugnant to those principles that must direct their private and public conduct, and their consciences. True all this is an activity in public affairs that is maliciously called meddling in politics, but it is an activity based upon those rights which are inherent in the Faith which we Catholics profess, an activity in defense of our rights only against the attacks made upon them, and an activity which would disappear on the day that those injustices disappear from our Constitution thereby granting Catholics the same liberty that is enjoyed in other countries.

Regarding those manifestations which Catholics have made against certain acts of local governors, all have been carried out in a lawful manner by them, which they had a perfect right to do, and none has been promoted in any manner by the Bishops. Therefore, we do not see in them any reason for the charge that we are hostile to the Government.

There is not the least doubt that the Mexican Government could depend upon the sincere support of its Catholic citizens if it would repeal those laws which hold the people in bonds as regards religious matters, and recognize in an effective manner all the rights expressed in paragraph 1 of Article 24, and paragraph 11 of article 130, of the Constitution, but which has been nullified unfortunately by Articles 3, 4, 27, and 130, and restricted in Article 24 itself.

Would to God, Mr. President, that these statements might dissipate whatever doubt or mistrust you may have in your mind. And may God prosper a government that is to bring to the Mexican people the peace they have so long desired.

When American intervention last seemed imminent, the Mexican Bishops issued to the American people a public appeal that peace and friendship might prevail

between the Mexican and the United States Republics, and that brains not brutality should adjudicate the regrettable differences then threatening peace; and Catholic American Bishops made known this appeal to their flocks. Demonstrably, the Catholic Church is not back of intervention in Mexico, but is opposed to it by all its interests, and has resisted it to the extent of Catholic authority.

Among the alleged justifications for intervention in Mexico, which Secretary Fall has compiled, is the protecting of religious bodies from outrage. American officials of Protestant missions in Mexico have practically all denied that their missions need protection, and have announced their immunity to outrage. Incredible atrocities have undoubtedly been perpetrated on the Catholics of Mexico, and the persecution still continues. But the Catholic Bishops of Mexico oppose strenuously American intervention, and refuse the protection of American bayonets. In other words, no Church is behind intervention in Mexico. For further intervention will aid neither sect nor creed, but will tend rather to destroy what is still Christian in Mexico.

Step by step, with the loss of respect for religion in Mexico, has gone repudiation of governmental forms, with accompanying insecurity of life and property. These things have resulted from the inveterate intervention of foreign interests in the affairs of the Mexican people. The Latin civilization of the Mexican fostered pride in craftsmanship. The work of his hands had for the Mexican an intrinsic value apart from the wages it earned. In labor he expressed himself, fulfilled his destiny, and peacefully served his God. He was conservative in his customs, jealous of his traditions, instinctively religious and patriotic. Recurrent intervention has destroyed many of these characteristics, and left nothing of value in their stead. Unlike the Anglo-Saxon, the Mexican does not reach his apotheosis in the union laborer, working standardized hours at standardized rates, merely for gain. The Mexican despises the material life of the Anglo-Saxon and rejects the Anglo-Saxon creed. Harassed out of his own civilization and faith, he is now following the civilization and faith of Lenin, the Luther of Moscow. American intervention will foster this faith which may thence grow and spread until it is powerful to menace the existence of the governmental institutions of the United States. For the logical sequel to the destruction of a Catholic State is not a Protestant State. When a new formed Protestant State survives it does so only by virtue of preservative traces of Catholic morality. The destruction of Catholicism in a State is the destruction of revealed religion in it: and the end of that destruction is the anarchy or reformation of economic creeds which we call Bolshevism, and which is a faith fundamentally attempting to democratize, without Christ, the material civilization that is now distinctive of Anglo-Saxon culture.

Although the anarchy in Mexico is clearly due to foreign interventions, and has now reached the point where

religion is menaced and Bolshevism rife, preparations for further American intervention still go on, along with the Mexican preparations to withstand it. There are neither angels nor devils concerned in these preparations. Mexicans have undoubtedly been guilty of atrocities against Americans, and Americans have undoubtedly been guilty of atrocities against Mexicans. The Mexican honestly considers that the astute Yankee is exploiting Mexican resources in a manner detrimental to Mexican interests; and strives to curb Yankee astuteness by Mexican laws. The American honestly considers that he has valid claims to concession bargains, and holds it no wrong to fight governments and laws hostile to his claims.

And behind this confusion lies a real problem which cannot be solved by force and for which human wisdom has not yet devised a satisfactory solution; namely, the problem presented in the possession of valuable natural resources coveted by highly organized industrial nations, and even perhaps necessary to industrial progress, but held out of use by the possessing nation owing to backward industrial organization.

The Anglo-Saxon method of solving this problem is the primitive method of the barbarian-force, force without stint. The Rand gold in the possession of the agricultural Boers led to the British conquest of the Transvaal and Orange Free State Republics. But the problem of Boer and Briton still remains, and will remain until the British Empire perishes. Mexican oil in the possession of the agricultural nation of Mexico may lead to the American conquest of the Republic of Mexico, but the problem of Mexican and American will remain until the American industrial empire follows its British prototype to destruction.

The history of such disputes is stereotyped. American real estate transactions with the Indians are the model on which the business is founded. The more astute people obtain a coveted concession for a consideration which is relatively worthless in equity. After a series of similar transactions, the exploited people become educated in the wiles of concessionaires, and attempt to thwart them. The colored glass beads are then laid aside, and force rallies to fraud, until the intruder possesses or is dispossessed. So it has been throughout the centuries, so is it today in Haiti and in other quarters of the world, and so will it be tomorrow in the Republic of Mexico.

While Catholics may regret the selective silence of their Protestant fellow citizens, and deprecate the readiness they have shown to take advantage for proselyting purposes of interventions which they might have hindered, Catholics should remember that the religious motive is of negligible significance in such interventions. No Protestant and no Catholic of wisdom enough to exert authority would contemplate for a moment in this generation the use of war as a spiritual agency. Indeed, any American with a sense of shame must regard as trivial the slight inconveniences which the chaos in Mexico may bring to him; for American stupidity and greed

have fostered that chaos. The essential evil of the Mexican situation is its effect upon the Mexican people; the destruction of faith and hope and happiness in them who live in the growing shadow of the rising pinions of the American eagle.

A First Communion Hymn

AUSTIN O'MALLEY, M.D.

A FEW weeks ago the baby in our house made his First Communion. When he is called the baby he protests, but old folk are victims of habit. He uses a catcher's mitt bigger than his own blond head, and manages a baseball team which about four years ago dined from milk bottles. Within a few months when the Cardinal can reach down far enough, he is to be confirmed, and he has decided he will take the name Pat "because that's a man's name!" He has always been called Pat by his friends until his baptismal name has been forgotten. Pat is a natural name for him, just as one naturally calls an automatic pistol a gun.

Between colds and unpleasant recurrences like the measles and the whooping cough he goes to school in a convent, and of late the good nuns have been preparing the little ones for First Communion. The youngsters are drilled until on the great day there is beautiful precision. They are shown just how to receive Communion, and at rehearsal recently one small lad came away from the rail with his mouth held negligently wide open. He had not been told to shut it. Pat at the other end of the chapel remarked, "Sister, look at that guy's tonsils!"

Pat made his preparatory confession to the priest, and then he made it over again to the family at the dinner table merely as a matter of conversation. The next morning, raimented in white, he walked at the head of the procession up the main aisle of the convent chapel, a preeminence not so much of honor as of leg-length, or lack of length.

The candles burned like lit topazes among the red roses, and above them were frescoes of Our Lord telling the disciples to suffer the children to come to Him, and of Blessed Mère Julie among the babes of Namur; and through the windows came the hushed far-off murmur of the city streets into the chanting of the nuns.

The priest went on with the Mass, and the little lambs of God up near the sanctuary rail, between us and the feet of Christ, were as a trellis of jasmine blossoming. Presently silence fell, and the babies through the stillness began to sing very softly, like a May wind at dusk:

Put Thine arms around me
Feeble as I am;
Thou art my Good Shepherd,
I, Thy little lamb.

Jesus, Lord, I love Thee
With my whole, whole heart;
Not for what Thou givest,
But for what Thou art.

Come to me, sweet Saviour,
Come to me and stay,
For I want Thee, Jesus,
More than I can say.

Then the altar lights ran into lanes of misty flame before our eyes. Near me the wrong side of a mixed marriage slipped down on his unaccustomed knees. Up just behind the babies was the good man who has been supreme head of the Knights of Columbus for a generation past, the leader of the men who did big things during the war. He had the great honor, the greatest of his honors, that one of his children was among these First Communion babies, and all through the Mass the tears of consolation were running down this father's cheeks, as they were on every face I could see. Then the little ones went on:

Ah! what gift and present,
Jesus, shall I bring?
I have nothing worthy
Of my Lord and King.
But Thou art my Shepherd,
I, Thy little lamb—
Take myself, sweet Saviour,
All I have and am.

He took them with tears in His own eyes. Oh! but it was wonderful! I have seen many strange and wonderful things in the past three score years, but nothing more strange and beautiful than that First Communion. Why cannot the bloom on the grape last?

At the end the little lambs, with Him in their hearts, went out smiling up to us old folk—but it is too sacred to talk about.

*Mir ist als ob ich die Hände
Auf's Haupt dir legen sollt',
Betend, dass Gott dich erhalte
So rein und schön und hold.*

God be praised!

Press Comment and Public Opinion

A. J. BECK

“DID you notice England's attitude toward our President's latest speech?” “Yes, the London newspapers praised it highly.”

Such a dialogue may be overheard frequently in public places, if we substitute for England the name of any other country which is specially interested in some action or policy of our government. Many of our citizens think they hear in the comment of the metropolitan journals of London, Paris, Berlin, or Rome the voice of the English, French, German, or Italian people. Sometimes this inference is due to the exaggerated captions with which metropolitan dailies in our country “play up” foreign press comment on vital international issues. Thus, you may be shocked to read in bold-faced type: “Germany Threatens to Turn Bolshevist,” and under this “scare-head” you may find nothing more than the prediction of one or two editors or politicians. But many of us do not stop to think, and accept the views of a few men as

those of fifty million people. The Berlin or London editor writes as if he had been delegated by the entire nation to inform the world of its views, and we, always in a hurry, in spite of all our time-saving devices, thoughtlessly try to pick up the news while bolting a breakfast or dinner, and in consequence acquire erroneous ideas on certain topics of the day. Affairs might be otherwise, if the average man realized that there are trusts and combinations in the press as in steel, oil, and other industries; that capitalists and politicians buy and control newspapers to further their interests.

During recent years Germany's industrial life has been dominated by Hugo Stinnes. The “Coal King” has bought scores of newspapers and also some of the largest printing establishments in Germany. According to a recent report of the International News Service, he is not only gaining control of iron mines in Hungary and Slovakia but also “laying his hands upon newspapers in Vienna and Budapest.” However, he is not the first German press magnate. Even ten years ago the leading Berlin journals were in the hands of a few men. Mosse owned the *Tageblatt*, *Volkszeitung*, and *Morgenzeitung*; Scherl, the *Lokalanzeiger*, *Montag, Tag, Abendzeitung*, and *Taeglicher Vergnuegungsanzeiger*; Ullstein, the *Morgenpost*, *Zeit am Mittag*, and *Abendpost*; Girardet controlled publications in Hamburg, Duesseldorf, Eberfeld and Zuerich, while the heirs of Huck held newspapers in Leipzig, Halle, Stettin, Stuttgart, Hanover, Heidelberg, Breslau, Frankfort, etc. “Also the dominating German press,” writes Dr. Joseph Eberle (*Grossmacht Presse*), has become more and more a tool of mere business materialism with all its vices.”

In France Emil de Girardin reaped large profits by founding the sensation-mongering boulevard journals. Dr. Vernon, a quack, developed in the *Constitutionnel* and *Revue de Paris* samples of a venal “public opinion.” When churches and convents were confiscated in France some fourteen years ago a certain Duez was entrusted with the liquidation of this property for the State. He squandered millions of francs and subsequently admitted in court that he had paid between 150,000 and 200,000 francs to newspapers and news agencies to hush up his mismanagement. While the Catholic press of France is influential and represents the great majority of the people, the so-called neutral press of Paris, with its personal, political, or other interests, has a more extensive circulation; and it is this neutral press which is usually quoted on questions of the day in cable despatches to the United States.

The same holds for Vienna. For instance, our secular news agencies and metropolitan papers seldom cite the Catholic daily, *Reichspost*. Only during the Balkan War, when this daily obtained the most reliable news from the battlefields, was it mentioned often. This paper wields great influence among a Catholic people, still the Vienna paper quoted most frequently in our newspapers is the extremely liberal *Neue Freie Presse*, which was sold

some years ago to English and Austrian financial interests. August Zang, a baker in Paris, profited by the schemes of Emil de Girardin and founded the *Vienna Presse*. After making huge profits he disposed of it to some bankers. Other leading Vienna journals have a similar history.

Financial and centralized control of the metropolitan press is especially marked in England. Lord Northcliffe dominates some fifty journals. Even the *Times*, formerly known as a spokesman of the Government and considered one of the leading newspapers of the world, has fallen under the sway of this press magnate. Press despatches from London sometimes mention some of his organs; and when these open fire on the Government, the Cabinet's days are usually numbered. In view of the enormous capital required for financing scores of newspapers and because of the close relation between the highly developed industries of today and the press, one can draw his own conclusions as to the views likely to be propagated by a king of newspaperdom. Pierre Mille, a Frenchman, wrote in 1901 (*"Questions Diplomatique et Coloniales"*): "In England the large morning journals by no means reflect the views of all social strata. They rather give those of the leading classes, and these are industry and high finance . . ."

It would be absurd as well as unjust to deny a man the right to air his views just because he is a captain of industry, or represents high finance, or controls a chain of newspapers. Sometimes his opinions coincide with those of the masses of the people; and he has the right to employ legitimate means to protect his interests. However, the people should realize that his score or two of journals do not, as a rule, voice the opinion of as many different sections of the country. Syndicate journals should be recognized as such, especially abroad.

And Europeans have perhaps as much reason to bear this in mind when reading comment of metropolitan newspapers published in the United States, as we have when perusing London or Berlin or Paris press utterances. We, too, have our press magnates controlling chains of publications, dailies, weeklies, and magazines. We have news agencies which, while dominated by a few men, shape the policies of hundreds of publications. That metropolitan papers are often unsafe guides to public opinion, was illustrated in recent years by elections in New York, Chicago, St. Paul, and many other cities. Mayor Hodgson of St. Paul had every daily but one against him. Nevertheless he was elected. The late John Purroy Mitchel was supported by nearly all the newspapers of New York City; they hailed him as the patriotic candidate for mayor, but he was snowed under, in a storm of ballots. In the last presidential campaign numerous dailies and weeklies supported ex-Governor Cox in districts and cities that rolled up overwhelming Republican majorities. Again, Ireland's struggle for justice is misrepresented daily by hundreds of publications which seem to have lost the traditional American sense

of fairplay and love of liberty. Yet this is not surprising in view of the widely published admission of a foreign propagandist that he supplied scores of journals in this country with information during the war. Perhaps, another sidelight on the situation is supplied by a statement made in April, 1900, at a Philadelphia hotel, by a British press magnate. It was given to a reporter who is still living and it was in substance as follows: "Our syndicate controls, I would say, at least eighteen papers in the United States, leading papers, so you see we have extensive American interests." When pressed for details, the gentleman replied: "I decline to name them."

COMMUNICATIONS

Letters as a rule should not exceed six hundred words

What is Going on in Haiti

To the Editor of AMERICA:

As the Delegates of the *Union Patriotique d'Haiti* to the United States we desire to express to you our most heartfelt appreciation on the part of our oppressed people for the splendid editorial and the excellent articles in the recent issues of *AMERICA*. The articles have been accurate to the last detail and have breathed that splendid idealism and desire for justice which we feel certain will be that of the entire American people when the facts about Haiti become fully known.

But therein lies our difficulty. Indeed word has just reached us that a new order of the day rigidly muzzling the press of Haiti has just been proclaimed by Colonel Russell, the commandant of the Marine Corps, who is the dictator of Haiti. You may recall that when Mr. Harding took up the case of Haiti during his last campaign the censorship of the press and interdiction of free assembly which had existed for five years in Haiti were lifted. The six months' respite indeed enabled the Haitians to lay their case before the American people, the "Memoir" recently written by us embodying that expression.

Accompanying the written order of the day was an even more sinister verbal command to the effect that no Haitian newspaper might reprint any portion of the "Memoir" or "any American newspaper comment thereon." The Haitian people are not to know that there is a fine liberal American sentiment in this country which does not countenance the tyranny, brutality and indeed the violation of America's own fundamental traditions.

But what is most grave in our view about this latest act of oppression is that it would seem to indicate that there are within the Republican party considerable elements which are by no means unsympathetic with what the Democratic administration, under cover of a strict censorship, inflicted upon Haiti. We cannot believe, however, that such sentiments represent the wish and will of the American people. What we have asked is simple and elementary enough—a Congressional investigation which will reveal to the world the entire and absolute truth of the charges that we have made and will prepare the way for a course of elementary justice and fair play for our country.

We are enclosing a copy of *L'Essor* which gives the proclamation, and also the last comments of the American press. The next day such comment was forbidden verbally. M. Jolibois and M. Lanoue, editors of the *Courier-Haitien*, were also arrested and thrown into prison because their paper carried over its masthead an appeal to President Harding to withdraw the Occupation.

H. PAULEUS SANNON,
C. STENIO VINCENT,
P. THOBY,

Délégation de L'Union Patriotique d'Haiti aux Etats-Unis.
New York.

Napoleonic Legends

To the Editor of AMERICA:

The writer of the letter on Napoleon, in AMERICA for June 12, is a well-known student of Napoleonic problems. His book on Marshal Ney and his "Napoleon's Brothers" make delightful historical reading. His criticism cannot be overlooked, and I must therefore answer by the card.

Mr. Atteridge calls in question the existence of the storm, which I stated raged over St. Helena while Napoleon was in his agony. The log books to which he refers admit that there was at that time some atmospheric disturbance. Now, sailors accustomed to wind and storm are not easily frightened even by a good-sized "blow." The fact that the squadron did not put out to sea is not a conclusive argument against the existence of the storm. British seamen stationed by their Government on strictest patrol duty at St. Helena would certainly not abandon their post, so long as their ships could find shelter. Though the storm swept over the Island, it seems to have been especially violent on the Longwood plateau. There were sheltered zones along the coast, where without being obliged to head for open water, the ships could find a safe anchorage.

The storm is mentioned by most of the historians of Napoleon. H. A. L. Fisher (Cambridge History, vol. IX, p. 769), states that the Emperor passed away "in the midst of the great hurricane." In his "Napoleon: The Last Phase" (p. 239), Lord Roseberry says the same, mentioning trees and soldiers' huts blown down "as by an earthquake." Norwood Young's "Napoleon in Exile" (vol. II, p. 224), speaks of a squall with more force in it than usual and of a gum-tree thrown down. Rose in his "Life of Napoleon" (vol. II, p. 526), describes the storm sweeping over the Island and uprooting large trees. These facts are confirmed in Sloane's "Life of Napoleon" (vol. IV, p. 234), Hazlitt's "Life of Napoleon" (vol. VI, p. 103), in Hoeffer's "Nouvelle Biographie Générale" (vol. XXXVII, art. Napoléon). An eye-witness of the Emperor's agony, his physician, Dr. F. Antommarchi, in his "Derniers Moments de Napoléon" (vol. II, p. 158) states that he heard and saw the storm: "Le temps était affreux, la pluie tombait sans interruption, les vent menaçait de tout détruire." He also speaks of uprooted trees.

My authority for the statement that Napoleon called the day of his First Communion the happiest of his life is the Chevalier de Beauterne. In his "Sentiment de Napoléon Ier sur le Christianisme" (p. 50), he positively affirms that the Emperor made such a declaration "dans une circonstance solennelle," and that he had kept of his First Communion Day "un vif et profond souvenir." The solemn occasion referred to was well known to many, although De Beauterne does not specify what it was. I see no reason for doubting De Beauterne's words here, although the splendid apology of Christ and His religion placed by him on the Emperor's lips is probably not the latter's work. Cf. also Bourguine's "Première Communion et Fin Chrétienne de Napoléon." Cf. La Croix, Paris, April 26, 1921.

I agree with Mr. Atteridge in his condemnation of Napoleon's neglect and cold contempt of religious practises while in power. When at the Tuileries and on other occasions in peace time, the Emperor heard Mass on Sundays and the Concordat holidays. He could not of course and did not approach the Holy Table. Mr. Atteridge's views and mine on the restoration of religion by the victorious soldier and then on his attempt to degrade it into a mere cog in his State machine can be reconciled, although apparently contradictory. Mr. Atteridge has in view Napoleon's subjective consistency, his consistency with his general purpose and program. He evidently holds that in binding religion to his triumphal car, he was consistent with his paramount plan of submitting everything to himself. I mean that in re-establishing religion, which of its nature should be untrammelled by Prince or State, he was inconsistent in making it his tool. Napoleon, says Mr. Atteridge, was consistent with himself.

Granted. But I maintain that in regard to religion such action was not in keeping with the right and objective order of things. In restoring religion he was right; in enslaving it, illogical and wrong. I hope this explanation may satisfy my scholarly critic.

New York.

JOHN C. REVILLE, S.J.

Light on the Interest Question

To the Editor of AMERICA:

One can agree with Father Judge that all that any property produces rightfully belongs to the owner, and still maintain that interest on capital is the result of economic injustice. The reasons presented by Father Judge as justifying interest have been answered by that able economist Richard T. Ely, Ph.D., LL.D., professor of political economy in the University of Wisconsin, in "Outlines of Economics," a work in which he was assisted by Thomas S. Adams, Ph.D., also professor of political economy in the University of Wisconsin, Max O. Lorenz, Ph.D., assistant professor of political economy at the same university, and Allyn A. Young, Ph.D., professor of economics in Leland Stanford Junior University. The chapter on interest in this book contains the following:

Inadequate Explanations of Interest.—An idea that naturally suggests itself is that interest has to be paid for the use of money because "money can be profitably employed in business." This explanation, which is very much like one of the ways in which the canonists finally came to justify interest, is obviously inadequate. It is only an attempt to explain loan interest by assuming the existence of imputed interest. What we want to know is why "money can be profitably employed in business."

A similar, but somewhat more definite, attempt at an explanation is contained in the statement that interest is paid because capital is productive. It is pointed out that by the use of capital goods the product of industry is greatly increased over what could be produced by labor and land alone. This is, of course, true, but taken alone it does not explain interest. The problem of interest relates to the *value* of the product, not to the *amount* of the product. There is nothing in the mere quantity of the product that gives value to it. The farmers of this country have found more than once that a large wheat crop has sold for less in the aggregate than a small one.

It should be apparent that the productivity of the stock in the poultry business, as a whole, has no relation to the rate of profit obtainable, and therefore does not effect the rate of interest on an investment in that business.

The "Outlines of Economics" argues for the justification of interest because of the difference between present and future values; in other words, interest, it is contended, is compensation for delaying the personal use of one's wealth. As this book puts it:

The fact still remains that waiting is a sacrifice, and in order to induce the saving that is a prerequisite to the use of capital in industry, a premium or reward for waiting has to be paid in the form of interest. *This fact is the most fundamental thing in the explanation of interest.* (Italics inserted.)

The capitalistic owner abstains from the use of some material thing, and that thing is also preserved to its full value by the renter of capital; the renter does not consume it, neither does society. Therefore, neither the renter nor society owes compensation to capital in the form of interest. In fact, for preserving the full value of capital, the renter ought to be compensated. Of course, society gains the advantage of the productivity of capital, but great productivity is the cause of lessened value, as indicated by Professor Ely.

Father Judge terms it "economic heresy" to hold that "though natural agents concur to produce economic fruits, their usefulness is entirely gratuitous." Let us assume the opening of new and extremely productive wheat land. With the same number of workers, wheat would be more abundant and cheaper.

Certainly, then, the use of the rich land would be a free gift to society; and the measure of the free gift would be the difference between the productivity of the rich land and the poorest land that had been in use for wheat growing. If land were infinitely productive, it is clear that there would be value attaching neither to the product nor to the land. The richest wheat land would have but nominal value if the product were sold locally. The cause of rent and interest is the selling of commodities outside of the community in which they are produced.

Providence.

M. P. CONNERY.

The Labor Spy in American Industries

To the Editor of AMERICA:

There appeared in your issue of May 28 a communication signed by Mr. Neacy, in which occurred the following passage:

The fact remains that neither a priest nor a layman has any right, even when he has the best of intention, to be classed other than an amateur when he attempts to discuss industrial subjects without at least a rather full knowledge of the workings of plans gained on the spot and from the inside, rather than from the contents of a reference library.

This criticism was directed, in kindness, against Father Husslein, and no doubt the writer, when he had concluded his communication, felt that he had proved, in this instance at least, the incompetence of the priest to discuss industrial subjects with authority. Father Husslein answered the charge, but I have a suspicion, that despite the answer Mr. Neacy though dislodged, has not entirely withdrawn from his position. I am chiefly interested in the opinion of Mr. Neacy, first, because it is one quite commonly taken by many well-informed people, and secondly, because it does much to discount the value of sound advice from really authoritative quarters.

As for the statement, quoted at the head of this letter, I admit it as it stands. But it is not meant as it stands, else it is quite meaningless because altogether obvious, and it cannot be imagined that anyone would hold the contrary proposition. Synopsized, it reads: neither priest nor layman (to which may be added to show how blunt the statement is, "capitalist, laborite and others") has any right to discuss industrial subjects without a rather full knowledge. To be sure, no one has the title to teach, without the credentials of knowledge. What Mr. Neacy really means is that the priest and layman because of their isolation from actual industry are in no position to secure these credentials.

Now the view is very widespread that many "laymen" are today meddling in industrial controversy who have only the remotest knowledge of the actual details of operation upon which many of the larger questions depend. The implication of the statement, quoted above, as well as the whole tone of his letter, makes me certain Mr. Neacy holds this opinion. Personally, I think the opinion altogether correct. But Mr. Neacy goes further, I fear,—if not, he will absolve me and allow me to continue the case—and predicates in his own mind this intolerable ignorance of the details of the struggle of the whole class of priests and laymen who have entered this field.

Emphatically, such is not the case, as Father Husslein has pointed out, instancing Bishop Ketteler and Pope Leo XIII as brilliant prophets in labor controversy. More than this, or less than this, as one cares to view the matter, there is no reason why such should be the case. For what, after all, are the credentials of the authoritative writer and speaker today on social and industrial topics, and who are those that actually possess these credentials?

This is an important inquiry for Mr. Neacy and for all who are sincerely interested in the solution of the great questions before us. In industrial and social matters, hardly less than in those religious, there must be a fountain-head of authority, if the system is to be based upon commonly accepted principles

and enjoy, what is daily more necessary in our sensitive industrial state, some uniformity in its plan of operation. Ultimately those principles must find root in sound ethics; and that plan of operation must be drafted, with the good of both the employer and the employee taken into full consideration. A knowledge, therefore, of the philosophy underlying the relations of man to man, and of the individual to the body politic, commutative and legal justice as it is technically called, is first and foremost required. I could point out in Mr. Neacy's letter a mistake he has made on a matter of principle, fraught with greater danger, than, say, for the sake of discussion, Father Husslein's alleged misinformation regarding the Cudahy strike of 1918.

More than this, our authoritative writer must possess an extensive background of industrial and general history, and fortify this knowledge with what may be necessary from the departments of economics and politics. All this training for the expert in industrial affairs, remote, if you will, but none the less indispensable, is accessible to all who may seek it and can afford it, and it seems to me more accessible to the student, the priest for instance, than the man actively engaged in industry.

Along with this academic and by no means superfluous training, a "rather full knowledge of the workings of plans" is required for one who pretends to authority in industrial matters. And if the difficulty lies here, and Mr. Neacy is of the opinion that such priests and laymen do not exist, he is woefully out of touch with certain facts and factors in our recent industrial history. It would appear, for example, that he does not know the development of certain important minimum-wage legislation in this country, in a locality, by the way, more proximate to his own State than to mine. Or has he forgotten, for instance, what was the personnel of the very War Labor Board to which he refers in his letter?

The requirements I have briefly indicated here for an authority in industrial subjects are met by Father Husslein, as his work will show, and it is precisely because he knows the social-labor question from the tip of the natural law to the other extremity of actual shop conditions, that he now writes with acknowledged authority both for this country and for England.

Briefly, then, the point is this: because a man neither works in a factory, nor sits in at a meeting of a Board of Directors, it may not be assumed that he will write without authority on industrial topics. The fact is such men are among us, and are carrying greater weight every day. In the opinion of many they are the only competent judges we have. The test is not, what is the writer's profession: but has he sound principles, does he view the particular question in its general background, has he got the facts, and how practicable is the solution he offers?

Woodstock, Md.

PETER V. MASTERSON, S.J.

Catholics in the Merchant Marine

To the Editor of AMERICA:

May I interest your readers in the cause of the Catholic men and women of the Merchant Marine? And may I, without offense, ask and answer two pertinent questions? What are the Catholics of the world doing to prevent a leakage to the Faith, or at least its practise, among Catholics of the Merchant Marine? The answer is that they are doing very little, and I challenge contradiction.

How many institutions or stations have we for them on this continent? Again the answer is that we have about half a dozen. On the other hand, non-Catholic effort is manifested in every port of the world, and the many fine institutions, well fitted up and managed, is a further proof of non-Catholic zeal. What are we going to do about it? Is there not needed an apostolate for those who go down to the sea in ships?

Montreal.

WILLIAM H. ATHERTON.

AMERICA

A · CATHOLIC · REVIEW · OF · THE · WEEK

SATURDAY, June 25, 1921

Entered as second-class matter, April 15, 1909, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at Special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 29, 1918.

Published weekly by The America Press, New York.
President, RICHARD H. TIERNEY; Secretary, JOSEPH HUSSEIN;
Treasurer, FRANCIS A. BREEN.

SUBSCRIPTIONS, POSTPAID:

United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$4.00
Canada, \$4.50 - - - Europe, \$5.00

Address:

THE AMERICA PRESS, 173 East 83d Street, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.

CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW

Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts.

The Congressman and His Oath

A NEW YORK Congressman recently remarked that the country might have all the social legislation it wished, including the Sterling-Towner bill for Federal education and the Sheppard-Towner maternity bill, provided the country were willing to pay the price. What this gentleman wished to stress is altogether true, namely, that Federal legislation, especially social legislation, which pretends to relieve a local necessity free of charge, is a fraud. When a burden is shifted to the Federal Government, the local community will assuredly pay the bill, and pay more than if the burden were borne on local shoulders. But underlying the Congressman's statement is an assumption which is also true. This assumption is that, according to the current practise, the test of any bill before Congress is no longer, "Is this bill constitutional?" The older standards have changed. To-day the test is either, "Can we afford it at this time?" or, more usually, "What effect will this measure have on politics?"

True, the financial aspect should not be neglected. But it ought to be secondary. Every man in Congress is bound by oath to support the Constitution of the United States. He is pledged as solemnly as the civil power can pledge a man to do nothing that will directly or indirectly conflict with the supreme law of the land. He calls Almighty God to witness that he will be faithful to his pledge. He is bound, therefore, to vote against any measure which he believes to be contrary to the letter or spirit of the Constitution. The responsibility is his alone, and he cannot shift it to his constituents. This he must make a matter of conscience, and if he has no conscience in voting, he shows that he is incapable of understanding the nature of an oath. If he votes to

adopt a bill which he believes unconstitutional either because the bill is "popular" or because he has been so ordered by his party, he violates his oath as completely as if he had voted for a bribe. There is no difference in this respect between the man who sells his vote for \$1,000 and the man who sells it for the favor of his party or of his constituents. His party is not pledged by formal oath, nor are his constituents. But the Congressman is.

It would be enlightening to know precisely how many Congressmen are fully acquainted with the measures for which they vote, or how many State Governors have so much as read the numerous social experimentation bills which they solicitously recommend to the attention of Congress. When it was stated in the Senate that thirty-six Governors had assented to the Sheppard-Towner maternity bill, Senator Borah at once asked, "What was the matter with the other twelve?" The sole constitutional argument advanced even by this bill's warmest friends is the over-worked "general-welfare" clause. But in all common-sense, it should be remembered that this is not the sole and only clause in the Constitution, and that it does not confer upon the Federal Government the right and duty to safeguard the general welfare by any and all means imaginable. Were this the case, and were the Federal Government empowered to act for the general welfare as Congress might choose to act, the Constitution would be worthless. Whether the "general welfare" or any specific measure be contemplated, Congress can act only according to the powers given by the Constitution. But this is an old-fashioned interpretation; almost as outworn as the theory that every Congressman is bound in conscience to vote against any bill which he believes to be unconstitutional.

Free Speech in Haiti

DOES a state of war exist between Haiti and the United States? Or, answering this question in the negative, when did the war terminate? But if the war is now at an end, under what warrant do we impose military rule upon the Island? And is it the intention of the United States to continue to govern the inhabitants by military regulations, abrogating the laws hitherto made by the Haitians themselves?

These questions demand an answer, and the answer should be forthwith determined. On May 26, Colonel John H. Russell, commanding the American forces in Haiti, issued an order which practically terminates freedom of speech in that country. It is unfortunate that a measure of this kind is thought necessary; doubly unfortunate that it has been issued by an American officer, with the approval of the Secretary of the Navy. The order is couched in terms that cannot be misunderstood.

While the freedom of the press and of speech are practically unrestricted, articles or speeches that are of an incendiary nature or reflect adversely upon the United States forces in Haiti, or tend to stir up an agitation against the United States

officials who are aiding and supporting the Constitutional Government of Haiti, or articles or speeches attacking the President of Haiti or the Haitian Government, are prohibited, and offenders against this order will be brought to trial before a military tribunal.

In other words, a civilian who by word of mouth or in writing makes any suggestion which, in the opinion of a military satrap, "reflects adversely upon the United States forces in Haiti," will be tried forthwith, not by a jury of his peers, nor according to such forms of law as may have been established by the once free people of Haiti, but by his accusers, and at a drumhead court established by the invaders of his country. In the opinion of Colonel Russell, and by inference, in the opinion of the Secretary of the Navy, this military order which abrogates the civil process in a country with which we are not, presumably, at war, but which we have occupied and hold by force of arms, leaves "freedom of the press and of speech practically unrestricted."

There is a document, the supreme law of the land, which defines the powers of the Federal Government at home and abroad. That document is the Constitution of the United States. It may be searched, but in vain, to justify the destruction of free speech by a Federal officer either in the United States or in a country with which we are not at war. Therefore, this order is a tyrannical usurpation. And since the Constitution is thus lightly set aside to justify a military rule abroad, how long will it be before the Constitution is set aside to justify a military rule at home?

Before this question, those Haitians who are disposed "to reflect adversely upon the United States forces in Haiti" fade from the picture. Or, rather, their cause becomes our own. No man can assert liberty for himself while denying it to others, or, to quote our greatest American, a statesman who fought the enemies of the Constitution within as well as beyond his own household, "can long retain it."

The Language of the Educated

FILLED with a noble rage at the needless introduction nowadays of so many new words, or of old terms with fresh meanings, into our written language, Mr. Richard Le Gallienne gives free expression to his feelings in the June *Harper's*. Among the excessively employed neologisms that cause him the keenest pain are *reactions, to gesture, to register, to function, to voice, inhibition, control, motivation, will-to-power, complexes, psycho-analysis, colorful, humans, vibrant, the discard, mentality, uplift, to intrigue*, etc. He ends with an earnest appeal to writers, public speakers and "persons of taste" to exclude rigorously from the vocabulary of "polite speech" all new words, which do not fulfil a purpose not hitherto served and which are not "refined," as Dr. Johnson remarks, "from the grossness of domestic use, and free from the harshness of terms appropriated to particular arts," terms in short, drawing "that atten-

tion on themselves which they should transmit to things." "Against words that stand out like fresh paint," is Mr. Le Gallienne's earnest closing plea with the reader, "or shriek from their context like a megaphone, or introduce the irrelevant colors or accents of special interests—technicalities of the arts, sciences, philosophies, professions or trades—we should constantly stand on guard."

"What are the marks of an educated man?" is a question often heard these days, when short-cuts to every variety of perfection are loudly hawked in the marketplace. Though grave doctors will probably differ regarding the precise nature of all the qualities that the well-educated should possess, everyone no doubt will agree that a man cannot be rightly termed *educated* till he has shown himself capable of speaking and writing his own language not merely grammatically but with a fine sense of the correct use of words, and with a just appreciation of their force and value. This can be acquired, as a rule, only by familiarity with good authors or by frequenting the society of the refined and cultured. A man, for instance, whose daily vocabulary is limited to only a few hundred words, representing for the most part the language of the street, the "comic" supplements, the "grossness of domestic use" and the technical terms of a profession or trade, cannot justly be considered *educated*. A woman, too, seems to imperil her title to the word if her working vocabulary is made up largely of the meaningless slang phrases and cant terms of the hour, or if she is hopelessly addicted to the use of tiresome neologisms like those that sadden the heart of Mr. Le Gallienne. To the discerning a single sentence spoken in their hearing is often quite enough to indicate unerringly whether the one who uttered it is or is not a person of education. How important it is then that youths and maidens who mean to make a success of life should thoroughly master the art of using the words of our language with accuracy, force and discrimination.

Protestantism's Roots and Tendencies

THE former Protestant Episcopal Bishop of Delaware, but a Catholic layman now, Dr. Frederick Joseph Kinsman, in his excellent book on "Trent," subjects to a searching analysis the early character and the present tendencies of Protestantism. He reaches the conclusion that the great religious revolt of the sixteenth century was chiefly due to three deep-seated disorders: "restiveness at spiritual authority, restiveness at the demands of asceticism, restiveness at the supernatural," tendencies, in other words, "to a spirit of anarchy, to the habit of self-indulgence, and to the philosophy of materialism," and tendencies, be it noted, that seem stronger in our day than ever. Developing his thought, Dr. Kinsman writes:

There was rebellion against authority as such. To begin with, it was revolt of the laity against the clergy on the assumption that none had right to exercise authority over another in spirit-

ual things; and this in spite of the fact that the overthrow of constituted authority resulted in setting up some intolerable tyranny. As often happens, the removal of legitimate authority was destructive of freedom. "Priestcraft" was milder than preachercraft; and both of them trifles compared to kingcraft. Luther, Calvin, and Henry VIII were in their respective ways more intolerably tyrannical than Popes and Curia. Lay usurpation in matters of religion proved a terrible evil in its first exhibitions, and futile for its ostensible purposes in its milder and later forms. . . .

There was also a common hatred of asceticism, a revolt of human passions against the Church's strict control. Henry VIII and Luther found many to back them in their war on monks. Instances of monastic corruption there undoubtedly were; but the clamor against corruption was mere pretext for pillage. Greed for monastic wealth was the determining cause of most attacks; but there was also root-hatred of the ascetic principle. The standards of the religious life, as of the celibate clergy, were a rebuke to an ease-loving people. In an age keen for physical well-being, no matter how some might disparage the beauty of the world, there was hatred of a discipline which conflicted with "the gospel of solid comfort." Protestantism always explained away the Evangelical Counsels.

There was, in the third place, a restiveness at the supernatural. Reformers might begin with denouncing indulgences or something else; they invariably ended by assailing the Priesthood and the Mass. It was always the Mass that mattered, and always the Mass that was marred. The Mass was a miracle, and as such rejected. Modes and decrees of rejection might vary; but in some way or other there was charge of "superstition," by which was meant practical recognition of the supernatural. . . . It was only possible to believe in God, if He kept His distance. The minimizing of the supernatural in the early stages has led to complete denial of the miraculous in many of the later. The campaign against the Mass as guarantee of God's perpetual presence led on to denials of the Incarnation, the ultimate goal of the process being atheism. The overthrow of Sacraments in the sixteenth century led to overthrow of Creeds in the eighteenth; and both happened for the reason that self-sufficient man had ceased to feel the need of Divine grace and Divine truth.

No thoughtful person can fail to see to what a sad pass indulgence to the full in that three-fold restiveness has brought the world of today. The lawless Bolsheviks and the greedy capitalists of the year 1921 are the legitimate successors of the Protestant rebels and tyrants of four centuries ago. Our much married millionaires and our preachers and practisers of "free love" are the heirs of the subversive principles "bluff King Hal" and Dr. Martin Luther bequeathed to posterity. And the countless, ever-increasing sects, and the millions and millions of "unchurched" men and women now in the United States are a melancholy indication of what has resulted from the "right" of private judgment to rid every-day life of the supernatural and to keep Almighty God "at a safe distance."

"Distinguished Converts"

THE recent death-bed conversion of a prominent Calcutta soldier suggests to the editor of the *Indian Catholic Herald* some reflections which seem to be quite as applicable to the Catholics of the United States as to those of the East Indies. He writes:

There exists among Catholics a curious sort of snobbery, for which we must acknowledge the Catholic press is to a certain extent responsible. It consists in looking upon every conversion to the Catholic Church from among the higher classes as a tremendous compliment paid to God and to the truth. It is a sort of anthropomorphism which assumes that God looks upon the rich with open mouth, as we do; that He likes to see them all comfortably seated in the nave, whereas the poor may stand in the side-aisles and in the portico, exactly where Our Lord placed the publican. It should be understood that God rejoices as much over the conversion of a quarter-master-general's cook as over that of his master. The value of their souls is exactly the same, however much their clothes may differ.

Once we make this admission, we are free to rejoice that General Sir John Cowan joined the Catholic Church on his death-bed. The compliment paid by the Church to the General is infinitely greater than the compliment paid by the General to the Church; it saved the General, it did not save the Church; but even so, his conversion has an apologetic significance. It shows that in the opinion of one intelligent Protestant, Protestantism is a more comfortable religion to live in than to die in, a compliment no intelligent Catholic ever paid to Catholicism.

But there is more. The opinion prevails among the Calcutta higher set that Catholicism is a religion for the unsuccessful, for middle-class people, for those who cannot afford to go and drink at the Grand Hotel and dine at Peliti's, an opinion which expresses the truth with extraordinary exactness. Catholicism has always professed a plebeian preference for the poor and the middle-class. General Sir John Cowan's death should, however, console those of us who might feel hurt. It shows that one who probably dined more than once at Peliti's, knows where to go to, when he can dine no more.

It is often very diverting to watch our Catholics flock to hear the sermons of a convert-priest, especially if he comes from abroad, deserting for him the more eloquent but unromantic prophets in the pulpits of their own parish churches. By certain types of Catholics the convert is always assumed to be of a finer clay than their hereditary coreligionists, his social position more enviable, his books more readable, etc. Though the converts themselves, as a rule, are the very last to entertain any sentiment but that of the humblest gratitude for receiving the gift of faith, some of those who welcome them into the Church seem to act as if she, and not the converts, had won thereby signal honor and distinction. It is of course the earnest prayer of all good Catholics, as it was that of Our Divine Lord, that every single member of the human family, from now until the end of time should gain the grace of dying in the true Church. But God is no respecter of persons. The redemption of a poor slave's soul cost Him just as much as did that of an emperor. Every new fish, fortunate enough to be caught in Peter's net, deserves the hearty congratulations of all Catholics. But we nowhere read in Holy Writ that the death-bed conversion of a "wealthy and distinguished" public man gives more joy to the Angels of God than does that of a wretched and obscure sinner, whereas the fact that the poor had the Gospel preached to them was expressly cited by Him as the strongest proof that Our Saviour was the Messiah when the Baptist's disciples came for His credentials. "And blessed is he that is not scandalized" at the Church's love for the poor.

Literature

ANTONIO VIEIRA, THE "PORTUGUESE CHRYSOSTOM"

THE Portuguese Jesuit, Antonio Vieira (1608-1697) could be aptly chosen as an almost perfect representative of the many-sided activities of his Order. It is a wonder that some enterprising novelist has not selected him as the hero, the villain perhaps, of a sensational romance. Beside him the Rodin of Eugène Sue, Father Holt of "Henry Esmond" and the "Black Robe" of Wilkie Collins are tame. He was one of the greatest of missionaries in an age that sent Ricci and Verbiest to China, Spinola to Japan, Jogues and Brébeuf to Canada, and witnessed the labors of Alexander de Rhodes in Persia and De Nobili in India. Diplomat, ambassador of Portugal to Paris, the Hague, London and Naples, friend of King John IV, unofficial head of the War Office during his country's struggle with Spain for independence, reorganizer of its navy and commerce, friend of the persecuted Jews, protector of the Indians along the Amazon and in the depths of Brazilian forests, terrifying profiteers in their counting houses and electrifying Popes in the Vatican by an eloquence scarcely surpassed in the Catholic pulpit, a prisoner of the Portuguese Inquisition for rather harmless visions of a world empire for his beloved Portugal, preacher in ordinary to kings and queens, catechist to slaves and outcasts in the jungles of the New World, humble in honors which he vainly sought to avoid and unbroken amid sorrows he did not deserve, he is of the stock of the De Gamas, the Albuquerque and the John de Castros, the great empire-builders of Portugal. He was a zealous apostle. He is the greatest prose writer of his country, and on the roll of its authors, one name only can claim precedence over his, that of the poet of the "Lusiads," Luis de Camoens.

It is not Vieira the missionary or the diplomat we intend to sketch, but Vieira the orator, "the Portuguese Chrysostom." Although Southey, in his "History of Brazil," styles him a man "extraordinary, not in eloquence alone, but in all things," Vieira is little known to the English-speaking world. Many of his sermons have been translated into German, Spanish and French, while of these masterpieces it is almost impossible to find any trace in our language. Yet the old Jesuit has a message for our age. There is something modern in his straightforward aggressiveness, his hammer-like methods, his practical and popular handling of his subject. He is sensational in the best sense of the word, fearless in the denunciation of wrong whether Jews, slaves, or Indians be the sufferers, or kings, grandees or jeweled ladies be the culprits. The slave drivers of Marañon, the profiteers and usurers of Bahia, drove him from the country. The Portuguese court found him so unsparing of its gilded vices that it had him removed to Rome. Called before Pope Clement X and his court to preach to them, and have his orthodoxy tested, Vieira with the freedom of another Chrysostom, in a flaming evocation of the dead Pontiffs who formerly occupied Clement's throne and some of whose tombs were within sight almost of the Pope, summoned them from the grave to instruct their successor in his duties. Clement listened with amazement and something like terror to the daring preacher and like the good Pope he was, took both the man and his lesson to his heart.

Vieira, with the ease of the true orator, was at home in any pulpit. He was the delight of the slaves of Bahia and of the fierce Nheengaibas, the admiration of cultured Lisbon. His taste is by no means faultless, and leads him into occasional extravagance and bombast. From the rich soil of his creative genius, weeds occasionally grow under the very shadow of towering oak and cedar, by the side of the loveliest flowers. But this oratorical undergrowth never hides his massive rugged-

ness, his power and splendor. In spite of the tropical wealth of his imagination and the warmth of his fancy, he is clear in style and language and the general structure of his sermons. In one of those 200 masterpieces, he himself tells his audience what a sermon ought to be. Clarity, distinctness of thought and expression, should be everywhere stamped upon it. Yet, he adds, you must not think that for that reason a sermon will be low and commonplace, for in one of those original comparisons which abound in his works, he tells us that the stars are very distinctly seen and very bright, yet they shine down upon us from the heights of heaven. And these glittering lights mark the seasons for the peasant in the fields, they point the way to the harbor for the sailor on the seas; for the astronomer they become an object of endless study and admiration. Never was orator more popular. He speaks the language of the masses. Like Shakespeare he has mastered the technical language of every art, sport and craft; he never lacks the right word when speaking of law, hunting, war, commerce and government, of stocks and bonds, of the vanities of the court. He describes a sea fight as well as Dryden or Cooper. He handles the abstract truths of theology and philosophy with the ease with which he speaks to the natives of Brazil of their crops and their mines.

In his sermon for Sexagesima Sunday preached in the royal chapel in 1655, Vieira explains his idea of a genuinely Catholic sermon, thus giving us a picture of his own masterpieces. The preacher, he says, must take a single topic, he must define it clearly so as to understand it, divide it accurately so as to seize it in all its elements and parts, prove it from Scripture, establish it from reason, illustrate and confirm it with examples and from experience, explain its beauty, importance, necessity by a thorough examination of causes and effects, a study of the benefits to be derived, the evil results to be avoided. Then doubts must be answered, difficulties and objections cleared up, and the opposing arguments refuted with all the powers of his eloquence. He must then point out the fruit to be gathered, urge his hearers to action, win their sympathy and assent, persuade them, and close.

The sermons of Vieira are living things. They are full of spontaneity, freedom, originality, color, variety. The Jesuit was a man among men, with a vein of mysticism and extravagance in his character, but with the unmistakable marks of genius. We know of no other great Catholic preacher exactly like him. His oratorical stride is not the advance of Bourdaloue which is like the step of a Roman legionary. Vieira has the free and debonair swing of the hidalgo, the knight-errant of romance, bent on deeds of daring. From the trumpet of his golden eloquence, he blows a challenge at every unclean monster, and then joyously sets to the work of demolishing him. Like the host of Israel he stalks round and round the walls of the Jerichos, the entrenched citadels of sin, of injustice and cruelty and luxury. Seven times and more he makes the circuit, and with all the weapons drawn from the arsenals of Scripture reason, humor, sarcasm, a generous heart and a rich mind, zeal for souls and love of God, with apostrophe and appeal, with menace and promise, in sublime and daring imagery unsurpassed by Bossuet, he sees at last their ramparts overthrown. The pages of sacred or profane eloquence have no more magnificently audacious passage than the one in which, inspired by patriotism and faith, Vieira enters into controversy like Job with God Himself, on the occasion of the siege of Bahia by the Dutch, and tells Him that He owes it to His honor, the glory of His name, His very title of the God of truth and justice to save them from their foes.

Keen observer of men and life, and with something of the

whimsical astonishment at human follies, with which Gulliver examined the Lilliputian lost in the boundless waste of his palm, Padre Antonio owed his power not so much to his originality, the tropical fertility of his invention and the boldness with which he carried out the strategy of his oratorical campaigns. He owed it to his deep and tender love of his hearers. That love armed him with the double-edged sword of power and pathos. He is fearless in laying down before Pope, cardinals and monsignori the duties and responsibilities of their state of life, their punishments if they are not faithful. The physicians of the Confraternity of St. Luke at Lisbon, the good nuns of the Royal Convent of Odivellas heard some plain truths that must have made them wince and immediately resolve on better things. But in this austere fighter of so many iniquities and wrongs, the snows of tenderness and affection tempered the volcanic fires of his easily aroused passions.

Hard to the tyrant, he was all unction and affection to the slave and the Indian of his beloved Marañao. His greatest sermons were preached not in Lisbon or in Rome, but in the palm-covered shrines along the Amazon and the Tocantins. Then when he spoke to these poor children of the forest, his words had the simplicity, the color, the poetry, the unction, the tender compassion of the Master he so ardently loved, the Teacher who drew His lessons from the lily of the fields and the hen that clucks her little ones under her wing. The world will long admire the noble sermons on the Passion of Christ which Bourdaloue preached before Louis XIV and his court. But the one which in the depths of Brazilian forests, Vieira preached to his slaves and Indians has a deeper pathos. It is a gloriously incomplete monument of his eloquence, for the last pages are missing. Overwhelmed by his own emotion, by the tears and sobs of his listeners at the recital of the death of the Redeemer, Vieira had to stop. The pen of the faithful scribe, to whom we owe many of the glorious fragments of the orator, dropped from his trembling hands as his tears fell upon the unfinished page. That unwritten peroration is one of the noblest in the history of eloquence.

As the champion of the Indians Vieira was the Las Casas of Brazil, as a missionary he was a worthy disciple and imitator of the Anchieta and the Nobregas who labored in the same fields. As an orator he has something of a Homeric greatness and creative fecundity. In him there is an echo of the majesty, the simplicity, the noble familiarity of sentiment and diction of the Ionian bard. Ezechiel lent him his vigor and Isaias his splendor. Like Homer he slumbers at times and his slumbers beguile him into fantastic visions, extravagant dreams. He is the Michael Angelo of the pulpit, and like the sculptor of the Moses and the Pietà is occasionally led astray by his genius into the tortured and grotesque. But like the bard of the Iliad and the painter of the Sybils and Prophets, he is always great and, when at his best, frequently sublime.

JOHN C. REVILLE, S.J.

TO A NEWLY ORDAINED PRIEST

Thou clad about and coroneled with power!
On whose young brow,
That was so clear of care this latest hour,
The awe of Christ's anointing shineth now,
What mystery
Hath just been wrought and perfected in thee,
When, like a flame,
The Holy Ghost upon thy spirit came!
A subtle splendor shines upon thy hands,
That late were kissed
By the sweet unction's heavenly balm, and blessed
And bound with virginal and jealous bands.
Now, in thy face,
As in St. Catherine's in the olden story,

My wondering eyes can trace
The very look of Christ's beloved glory.

What new and leaping love assails thy heart,
That now must be
Compassionate of all earth's misery,
And sealed to Christ, from fleshly loves apart!

Thy lips are fragrant with the Bread of peace,
Thy breath

Is sweet with healing for the hearts of men,
Even to the doors of death

Thy voice can make the sinner clean again;
And at thy word, the spirit carked with woe
Will leap and laugh like suns upon the snow!

O consecrate

To more than archangelic ministry,
What offices and powers, glad and great,
Have sudden bloomed and fruited full in thee!
Thy youth is crowned with what supernal state!

From His unutterable height,
Enthroned in splendor, Christ is listening
For thy stupendous summons. Thou canst bring
His living Self from that celestial light.
Henceforth, each morn, from thy pure hands will rise
The savors of th' eternal Sacrifice!

Now Mary smiles on thee, thou happy one,
For unto thee hath passed her earthly care,
In thy close hold to bear

That Hope and Joy who is her very Son!

EDWARD F. GARESCHÉ, S.J.

REVIEWS

Trent. Four Lectures on Practical Aspects of the Council of Trent. By FREDERICK JOSEPH KINSMAN. New York: Longmans, Green & Co. \$1.10.

In this admirable little book the sometime Episcopalian Bishop of Delaware, who became a Catholic last year, publishes four lectures entitled, "The Council of Trent," "The Protestant Reformation," "The Significance of Trent," and "The Tridentine Attitude," which he delivered in St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore. Dr. Kinsman describes the purpose and results of the great sixteenth-century Ecumenical Council with a trained historian's logic and candor that will make his Catholic readers prouder of their Church, and with a gentle humor and freedom from all bitterness that his Protestant readers should find quite disarming. In the author's opinion it is only within the last century or so that the full meaning and permanent value of Trent have been realized. The fifteenth century was much like our age "in its cult of wealth, pleasure and refined comfort," but the chief reason why the spirit of the world has not invaded the Church now as it did then is because of the high standards set by the Tridentine Fathers and still maintained by the Holy See and the Hierarchy. Though "the Council was entangled in all the meshes of secular politics," the author well observes that it "vindicated the Church's independence by the persistence and dignity with which it refused to be deterred from its tasks by the bullying of secular authority." This analysis of the Reformation's true character and that of its promoters is especially keen and just. So disastrous have been the ravages of "private judgment" in the world during the past 400 years, that Dr. Kinsman is surprised to see so much Christianity still surviving outside the Church today, for Protestants, he thinks, are far better than their creeds and few are logical enough to carry "presuppositions to their goal."

The practical lessons Dr. Kinsman deduces from the Council are "uncompromising loyalty to Catholic truth, discriminating treatment of those in error, tactful preservation of Catholic

unity." In his closing pages he cherishes the hope that the maintenance of that attitude in this country today will bring innumerable non-Catholics into the Church. Speaking from his wide experience as a Protestant bishop, he writes:

Among non-Catholics the numbers who really understand what the Church is and hate her is comparatively small. In most cases aloofness and opposition are due to ignorance. Those outside are trying to serve Christ in the best ways they know, and are the Church's undeveloped friends and unsuspected allies. This must be remembered by all who have tasks of winning for the Church the "other sheep not of this fold." . . . Ignorance and separation are due to no fault of their own, but are the handicap of heredity and environment. . . . In dealing with anomalies in the Christian world, it is consoling to reflect that none now living have caused them, that few can be blamed for wilful continuance of them.

As the Catholic Church is the "true home of all that is sound in American aspiration and achievement," Dr. Kinsman is confident that Catholicism is destined to be the unifying religion of all American Christians.

W. D.

"The Next War." An Appeal to Common Sense. By WILL IRWIN. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co. \$1.50.

Here is a very forcible little book by a thoughtful war-correspondent who witnessed the worst of the horrors that happened when the world plunged into the great conflict of seven years ago and who now aims to make the reader realize in a measure what "The Next War" will be like. In a very informing chapter on "The Breeding of Calamity" the author reviews the factors that made the World War such a gigantic disaster. He regards April 22, 1915, during the Second Battle of Ypres, a very significant date in human annals, for

The Germans then rolled across the Western trench-line a cloud of iridescent chlorine gas which sent French, Arab, English and Canadian soldiers by the thousands back to the hospitals, coughing and choking themselves to death from rotted, inflamed lungs. . . . A new weapon was then first used which will make future wars conflicts not merely between armies, but between entire nations.

Mr. Irwin tells us plainly what to expect. As early as the time of the armistice, Americans were manufacturing the newly devised Lewisite gas which was an invisible, sinking substance killing at once if breathed. "Wherever it settled on the skin it produced a poison which penetrated the system and brought almost certain death." It was hostile to all cell-life and had fifty-five times the spread of any other "poison gas." Since then a gas even more deadly has been invented, a small grenade of which "can generate square rods and even acres of death in the absolute." Dropped from airships, these bombs "can eliminate all life" in big cities. The Great War killed in battle ten million soldiers and cost the lives of some thirty million civilians "who might be living today." But the mortality of "the next war" will be far worse than that, for "warfare by disease-bearing bacilli is already preparing in the laboratories." It will depopulate entire countries as did the medieval Black Death. The cost of the World War, both in actual money and in the destruction of lives and property, is computed to be three hundred and thirty-seven million dollars. Considering the deadly character of the new explosives and gases that will be employed in the next war, no one can reckon how great the cost will be.

Throughout his book Mr. Irwin gives figures to show what vast quantities of the world's wealth has been used during the past century or more simply for destructive purposes and how little constructive work in comparison has been done. His concluding chapter is a plea for general disarmament and the fostering of "international morality." But he fails to indicate how those highly desirable movements can best be promoted. The answer is simple. Let States as well as individuals keep the Ten Commandments and let the sanctions of the Christian religion bind rulers and diplomats no less than civilians and soldiers.

W. D.

A Social and Industrial History of England, 1815-1918. By J. F. REES, M. A. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co.

Labor's Magna Charta. By ARCHIBALD CHISHOLM, M.A. New York: Longmans, Green & Co. \$3.40.

After a brief and imaginative retrospect, bringing us back to the year 1350, Mr. Rees begins his story of the last hundred years of social and industrial history of England. It is told without partisanship and with a clear understanding of the conditions and movements in the economic world during this period of intense industrial activity. The successive theories that were passionately promoted by labor leaders, and the various attitudes of the English Government, from old Toryism to *laissez faire*, and so on to the more recent approach to collectivism are fairly presented. The author does not permit himself to champion any side or measure, and is sane in his criticism of ultra-radical platforms. Nothing of a constructive nature is offered, but this was not the purpose of the book. It perfectly answers its scope, offering the historic information intended to serve as a background for the study of modern social and industrial questions. In fact the writer is not oversanguine that any reform will meet with the hoped-for results: "We live in a world of men and women who will always be apt to mar the finest of their schemes and strive, however blindly, to achieve something nearer to the heart's desire."

The second volume can equally be approved and recommended, so far as its economic discussions are concerned. We may dissent from the author in giving to the labor clauses of the Peace Treaty the title of Labor's Great Charter, we may differ with him also in some of the views expressed on other features of this treaty, we may also fail to discover in the League of Nations our hope for the future betterment of the world, but the value of the book consists in the mass of the accurate information upon the labor question that is here laid before us. Where the preceding book gives us the British economic history of the past century, the present supplements it by an equally clear and fair exposition of existing labor conditions, not in England only but all over the world, with England as the center of observation. Mr. Chisholm's own economic conclusions are no less deserving of consideration.

J. H.

Greeks and Barbarians. By J. A. K. THOMSON. New York: The Macmillan Co.

The friends of the ancient classics should give the seven papers in this excellent book a cordial welcome. For the author, who wears his learning very gracefully, has the art of making his readers share his own enthusiastic admiration for all that was best in old Greek life and thought and for the literary masterpieces which we "Barbarians" of today have inherited from the geniuses of ancient Hellas. In "The Awakening" and "Keeping the Pass" Mr. Thomson lets Herodotus describe for us the beginnings of Greece, portray the picturesque Barbarians who lived in those far-off days, and tell how Leonidas and his immortal three hundred held the pass of Thermopylae against the hordes of Xerxes. The contents of Xenophon's "Anabasis" are so skilfully condensed into the author's paper on "The Adventurers," that those who recall their high-school days will wonder why they then found so dull a story which now seems so interesting. In the essay on "Eleutheria" (freedom), meaning "justice and the use of law without favor to the strong," the "best gift" of Hellas to the world, and in the following chapter on "Sophrosyne," that indefinable virtue that made the men of Athens' golden age what they were, Mr. Thomson is particularly good. In the paper on "Gods and Titans" he does not shrink from indicating how strongly withal the early Greeks smelt of the old Adam, and in the concluding essays called "Classical and Romantic" the author culls from the poets of Hellas many beautiful passages which are as "romantic" as anything in Celtic literature.

W. D.

BOOKS AND AUTHORS

Fiction.—Mr. J. D. Beresford's latest novel, "Revolution" (Putnam) is not a tale but a tract on the ills, particularly the labor ills, which afflict modern governments. In a preface which is an answer to his English critics, Mr. Beresford argues that European civilization has reached its highest point, is now in decline, and that we must look to the United States "for the development of the new world-order." This is an interesting thesis, but "Revolution" gives it little more than a passing glance; in fact, it dies with the preface. The more obvious conclusions which Mr. Beresford advances are that modern governments without exception are essentially dishonest, and that the future holds no remedy. Since the author seems to reject practical Christianity as a possible remedy for the evils which afflict men and governments, perhaps his conclusions are correct.—Sir Harry Johnson's "The Man Who Did the Right Thing" (Macmillan, \$2.00) is mainly concerned with the East African adventures of Captain Roger Brentham, a "good sort" of Englishman who weds the "missionaryess" he appears to have compromised, resists the enticements of a rich widow, treats the Negro justly, is fair to the Germans, is zealous for the growth of the British Empire and develops the "Happy Valley" plantation. The character-sketches in the romance and its vivid descriptions of African life are done with a skilful hand, but throughout the book there are sneering attacks on Christianity that make the novel objectionable.

The Catholic Mind.—The June 22 issue of this little fortnightly is an Independence Day number. Thomas F. Meehan tells about "The First Catholic Fourth of July," giving the sermon Father Bandol preached before "the President and the members of Congress and other distinguished personages" at the solemn *Te Deum* sung July 4, 1779, in St. Mary's, Philadelphia, an off-shoot of old St. Joseph's the Jesuits' Church in Willing's Alley, "the most important Catholic site in the United States." In 1734 Father Greaton, S.J., answering the challenge of Lieutenant Governor Gordon, declared

We have an open and public chapel back of Walnut Street where Mass is publicly celebrated and all the practices of our religion performed by right of charter of William Penn. Our land is in Pennsylvania, not in Maryland, and we are and of right ought to be free and independent of all civil authority retarding, restricting or debarring our religion. It is not toleration we claim. It is freedom we demand and will maintain.

The next article is Mr. John B. Kennedy's account of "The K. of C. History Movement," in which he tells how the Knights mean to "make American history safe for Americans" by publishing pamphlets which will correct the writings of certain un-American propagandists of today. Many of our readers will be glad to know that Washington's famous address to his Catholic fellow-citizens and theirs to him can be found in this number of the *Mind*. W. H. Grattan Flood then proves conclusively that "The Star-Spangled Banner" is an Irish tune, not English, and the issue ends with a keenly reasoned theological paper by Father Hull in which he discusses the question, "When Is Drinking a Sin?"

Editorial Writing.—It is almost as easy to learn how to train a seal by a correspondence course as to learn how to write an editorial by the same means. But "Editorials and Editorial-Writing" (Home Correspondence School, Springfield, Mass., \$3.00), by Robert W. Neal, despite first impressions, offers no short and easy manner of attaining proficiency in a difficult art. There is a welcome lack of the "get-rich-quick" methods so common in similar books, and much insistence on the truth that, given a certain adaptability, a journalist is made by hard work only. The volume is rich in examples, and can be recommended to all schools of journalism.—"Our Heritage from the Old World" (Appleton, \$2.00), by Josephine Greenwood, is a well-illustrated

and simply written history textbook beginning with Egypt and ending with the colonization period. The medieval and Reformation chapters, however, are treated from the Protestant viewpoint, and, in consequence, the author fails in her promise to take the logical view of history.—Mr. Emile G. Perrot, the Philadelphia architect and engineer, has brought out a beautifully illustrated brochure called "The Groundwork of Architecture or the Study of How Architectural Styles Are Affected by Structural Engineering." (Published by the author, 801 Parkway Building, Philadelphia). Mr. Perrot traces the development of architecture down from the ancient Egyptians and Greeks, through the Middle Ages to the Renaissance, showing how engineering problems were solved. The booklet contains two-dozen fine pictures.

The "Queen's Work."—Notable contributions to the June *Queen's Work* are Father Mullany's "Back Monday," a persuasive call to week-end retreats for men, Mr. Lord's description of the Good Shepherdesses' work for erring girls, and Father James J. Daly's paper on the Sacred Heart and these stanzas of his "To Ireland":

Your hair is streaming down the wind—
Each strand I recognize;
Your tears have made your bright eyes blind—
I know those soft gray eyes.
Dark little Rose, those tears you shed
Belong to eyes long closed and dead.

Your voice strikes all the stars with pain;
That voice wove my young sleep.
Why does that voice of dreams again
Come bleeding when you weep?
Dark little Rose, I heard your sigh
Pass through dear lips about to die.

I see red anguish in your face;
Hers was like Yuletide snow;
I should have died if any trace
Of sorrow marked her brow;
And yet your face ploughed deep with woes
Is hers, is hers, dark little Rose.

Your blood is mine, as hers is mine;
It flames with frenzied heat
To see your holy form supine
Beneath the world's coarse feet.
I know why blood so gladly flows
For your sweet sake, dark little Rose.

Teachers' Helps.—Shakespeare edited by the syndics of the Cambridge University Press now appears under the auspices of two such scholars as Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch and John Bover Wilson. The volume just issued, "The Tempest" (Macmillan: New York. \$1.40), contains, besides the usual features of such textbooks, a reproduction of the title-page of the first folio 1623, together with the Droeshout portraits, and the portrait of Elizabeth of Bohemia, daughter of James I. Besides these there are a textual introduction, a note on punctuation, and the stage-history of the play. The general introduction supplies the reader with some original literary and critical material. The structural and dramatic beauties of the work could, with much profit to the ordinary student, be more fully explained.—The "Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge" in its "Help for Students of History" entrusted the subject of Ireland to the Rev. Robert H. Murray, Litt. D. His little book is entitled: "Ireland" (Macmillan: New York). Dr. Murray is well acquainted with the sources, both Catholic and Protestant, as well as with the State archives which cover the period of Irish history extending from 1494 to 1829. What he himself says of one period, that of Catholic Emancipation, that the mass of material almost overwhelms the student must be said of the entire period studied by him. No one historian can possibly cover all the events of that drama. For, as Dr. Murray says, the time has come when the historian can now seldom write

"general history." He must confine himself to a single period, better still to the history of a single event or the biography of a single individual. Dr. Murray refers with impartiality to the more prominent authors who have dealt with Ireland, no matter what their religious or political beliefs. We think that there was much more behind the "land question" than the fact mentioned by Dr. Murray, that in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the Catholics in Ireland owed allegiance to the Pope, who then was a temporal prince. Direct allegiance in temporal matters they owed none. Might not the faith of the Irish people have had something to do with the grave injustices under which they suffered?—In Number 39 of the same "Helps" series, Father Hungerford Pollen, S.J., studies the "Sources for the History of Roman Catholics in England, Ireland and Scotland" (Macmillan: New York) Father Pollen's name alone is one of the best recommendations the work can have. The eminent Jesuit scholar, an authority on this phase of history, points out the copious authorities on the subject he discusses, found from the days of the Reformation to that of Emancipation. For the student of modern church history the little volume will be indispensable.

EDUCATION

Tommy's Foolish Parents

"DON'T be too hard on Tommy. I've always looked after him at home, and this new life is pretty nearly too much for him," said an over-indulgent mother to Mr. Thomas Arkle Clark, Dean of Men, in the University of Illinois, the author of a recent book called "Discipline and the Derelict, Being a Series of Essays on Some of Those Who Tread the Green Carpet" (Macmillan). The interview with Tommy's coddling mother is described in an excellent chapter on "Youngest Sons and Only Children," the perusal of which is earnestly recommended to the parents of intentionally small families. As Mr. Clark well observes:

It is a handicap, I am convinced, to be the only child or the youngest son or the son of but one parent. A beneficent Creator when He wrote the directions for running the universe decreed that every normal child should have two parents, and I think that either a greater or a smaller number than this generally results in an ill effect upon the child; and He intended also, until society made it unpopular, that there should be more than one child in every family, in order that one might help in the training and the education of the others.

When there is no child in the family but Tommy, especially if his father is dead, it is clear that the lad's chances of being completely spoiled by his doting mother are practically certain. "I cannot understand why my gifted son is not doing better at college" a perplexed and disappointed father may complain. "He is our only child and we have done everything for him." That was just the trouble. Tommy's parents had always "done everything" for him. He had never been asked to make sacrifices, to work hard or deny himself, but had grown up to young manhood a pampered, selfish, undisciplined weakling whose true character came out as soon as he had left his parents' protecting wings and was thrown on his own resources at college. "The coddled child seldom develops self-reliance and independence." In far too many instances the foolish parents of a youngest or an only son think of nothing but how to make life pleasant and easy for him. Whatever sacrifices are made in the family are by no means Tommy's. He successfully avoids doing every hard or disagreeable duty and grows year by year more thoughtless, soft and self-indulgent.

A COURAGEOUS MOTHER

WELL-TO-DO parents who are really willing to let their offspring develop initiative and form habits of self-reliance are said to be growing exceedingly rare nowadays. But Dean Clark tells about one mother who made a man out of her son

just by courageously letting him shift for himself a little. Her boy William was eager to make some money by finding a job which would rout him out at five in the morning and keep him busy till nearly school-time, so he begged his mother's leave to take it. She consented but only on these conditions:

"When William took the job I explained to him that he must manage himself; if he lost the place through failure to get there on time, it was his own fault. So he bought a 'Big Ben' to awaken him at the proper time; he gets his own breakfast, and he has never been late once. It took a lot of courage and self-control for me to hear him coming downstairs before daylight these cold winter mornings and not to get up and help him off, but William's character is worth more to me than my own selfish comfort in looking after him." She has been a thousand times rewarded in the years that have followed in the strong, sturdy, self-reliant son to whom she now looks up. Her way is the only way I know to make men of character and self-reliance and independence.

No one gains strength except through struggle; self-reliance comes through meeting hardships. There is no strength of character without sacrifice, and as we make it easy for our children, as we save them from the hard, unpleasant things of life unduly, we do them damage. It is the boy who has learned to do a task that is given him whether he likes it or not, who can direct himself and look after himself, who does not shrink from difficult and unpleasant things, who does not hesitate at sacrifice or self-control, who has been taught to think of the comfort and pleasure of others as well as of his own—it is this sort of boy who is going to get on in college and whose home training will show before he has been in the college community a week. Such boys are to a college officer like the shadow of a great rock in a weedy land. The spoiled, humored boy who has been kept from hardships and sacrifice, no matter with what loving care, will hardly escape a weak youth and a selfish ineffective manhood.

How much better it had been for Tommy if his parents, when they started married life in their early twenties, had not been very well off in this world's goods, so that their little son could not have had everything he wanted but would have been forced to bear a few privations now and then. But more fortunate still in his father and mother had Tommy been if they were only thoughtful and self-sacrificing enough to provide him in due season with four or five brothers and sisters, who would teach him from his very infancy the useful science of living with others and school him well in the ancient art of giving and taking. If Tommy has but thoroughly learned, before his character is formed, that there are many things he must do without, that hard work is the price that must be paid for what is really worth while in life, and that the world is full of other Tommies, each with his own rights, and whose wishes, disconcerting though it may be, are not always in perfect accord with his own, then the likelihood of Tommy's growing up a good man and a worthy citizen is very strong.

TOMMY'S OUTER CONSCIENCE

THE mother who feels that she should be always at her son's side, far into his teens, to tell him what to think, say and do is robbing him of all initiative and backbone. She cannot be acting as her Tommy's visible outer conscience forever. The important thing is that he be made as early in life as possible a person whose conduct is governed by sound ethical and religious principles. That his parents must see to. Fathers and mothers who give their offspring only life and health have discharged but a small part of their duty, for they are also bound to rear their sons and daughters to be heirs of Heaven and bulwarks of the State. There is little fear that children who have been properly brought up will ever get beyond the influence of their parents, for the memory of a good mother and a wise father will make their boys and girls set a high practical value, all through life, on the everlasting principles of right and justice which is the richest heritage that parents can leave their sons and daughters.

WALTER DWIGHT, S.J.

SOCIOLOGY

End of Dramatic Lock-Out in Clothing Trade.

ONE of the most notable struggles in the history of American industry was the fiercely fought lock-out in the New York clothing trade. Through six bitter months the struggle dragged on. Approximately \$2,000,000 were in the meantime raised on the workers' side to support the unionists, holding out to the last for the existence of their organization, the militant Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America. The ultimate triumph of the union was not due solely to the persistence of the men, but largely also to the loyalty of manufacturers in other centers, who refused to break their agreements with the Amalgamated.

Under the most adverse economic circumstances the clothing workers faced the lock-out directed against their organization. Unemployment was wide-spread and the "open-shop" movement at its white heat. Injunctions, arrests, and suits against the Amalgamated mounting into millions of dollars were the weapons used by the employers. The press was mobilized denouncing the union as a Bolshevik institution, with un-American, Soviet intentions. Its dissolution was demanded in the courts. The net result for the workers was a loss of 4,500,000 labor days, with \$30,000,000 wages, while the loss in production was estimated by them at \$100,000,000 in wholesale prices. Not least to be considered was the deflection of trade from New York into other markets. And what was the outcome of it all? Nothing more than the acceptance of an agreement based upon the very terms that had been proposed three weeks before the declaration of the lock-out, when Sidney Hillman, President of the Amalgamated, together with Major Gitchell, labor manager of the Clothing Manufacturers' Association, and others, drew up the following points:

- (1) The union shall assume responsibility for the production of its members.
- (2) Labor costs shall be reduced as necessary to enable manufacturers to do business.
- (3) Adjustment of the amount of reduction in cost to be made between each employer and a committee of his workers aided by representatives of the union and association.
- (4) Disagreements shall be referred to the market labor manager and to the general president for settlement. All cases so referred shall be settled by them.
- (5) Settlements shall be enforced by the impartial chairman.

There was certainly nothing Bolshevik in this program. Nor could Sovietism be charged against the union for any of its immediate aims.

INDUSTRIAL PLAN OF THE AMALGAMATED

THE industrial plan, known as the machinery of the impartial chairman, adopted by the Amalgamated, was sufficiently explained in an article on "Industrial Democracy in the Clothing Trade" (AMERICA, February 19, 1921). In its broad outlines the system is very similar to the Whitely plan, its essential features being the cooperation of employers and employed, acting through their representatives in joint councils, with an impartial person as chairman. In the scheme of the Amalgamated this ideal however is carried out most thoroughly. The co-operation amounts practically to joint management in industry, since rates, working conditions and such like matters are determined by mutual consent. Above all, the "impartial chairman" is given absolute power to settle with finality all disputes on which the representatives of capital and labor fail to agree, and the strongest sanctions are given into his hands to punish summarily either employer or employed who in the least might diverge from his ruling. This, at all events, is entirely admirable, and approaches closely to the great Catholic ideal. It is a direct step in the right direction, taken together by capital and labor. Chicago deserves the credit not merely of having initiated this plan, but also for having carried it out successfully, without strike, lock-out, or friction of any kind, to the satisfac-

tion of employers, employed, and apparently also of the public, during the last ten years.

BOLSHEVISM AND THE AMALGAMATED

BUT do I mean to defend, horrified readers may ask, the terrible, Yiddish, Bolshevik, red-flag-waving, Sovietized New York members of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America? Let us calmly study the case. The charges brought against the Amalgamated were supported by passages from the preamble to its own constitution. The first of these, couched in somewhat Marxian language, and inspired, no doubt, by Socialist convictions in the mind of its author, declares the existence of a class struggle. Considered merely as a fact no one can deny the class struggle. The manufacturers themselves illustrated it in their own lock-out. It has been with us since the Reformation. The Holy See strongly affirms it in its social documents. But the essential difference between the Church and Socialism, on this question, is that the former decidedly denies the necessity of a class struggle between capital and labor, seeks not to foment but to lessen it, and finally shows historically that the class struggle need not result from the mere fact of the private possession of productive property, although this should be as widely diffused as possible among the workers themselves. Such is the lesson of the medieval guilds. On all these points Socialism holds to opposite methods and conclusions. In practice, it will be noted, the Amalgamated has built its working plan upon a system of absolute cooperation between capital and labor, leaving the decision of all disputes to an impartial judge, thus lessening the class struggle where these methods are in operation.

THE ULTIMATE PURPOSES

BUT the attacks of the press and the efforts at legal suppression of the Amalgamated rested mainly upon another passage in the preamble. Defenders of the unions described it as a mere "flourish," although it was most probably conceived in a strictly Socialist sense by its author. It reads:

The industrial and inter-industrial organization, built upon the solid rock of clear knowledge and class consciousness, will put the organized working class in actual control of the system of production, and the working class will then be ready to take possession of it.

There is apparently a Soviet flavor to these words, yet here are the reasons for which Justice Bijur of the New York Supreme Court denied the manufacturers' motion for injunction and dissolution, based upon them:

I think the phrases quoted are quite innocuous. They express some ideal which it is hoped may at some time be achieved. But even if we do violence to its plain intent, and endeavor to read into the literal words a suggestion that it is hoped that the working class shall be put into actual control and possession of the instrumentalities of production rather than of merely the "system" of production, as actually expressed, there is still absent any statement or even implication that this is to be accomplished by forcible or other unlawful means.

A perfectly harmless interpretation certainly was that given by President Hillman before the Senate Committee on Education. It is thus described in the passage from the report printed in the New York Tribune for June 10:

Senator Sterling questioned Hillman closely as to what the Amalgamated purposed to do about getting control of the clothing industry.

"We want labor to be free and master of its own destiny," said Hillman.

"What do you mean by that?" asked Senator Kenyon.

"We feel sure that if the workers in the clothing industry are able to establish a plant of their own and operate it successfully so as to put every other employer out of business we have a perfect right to do it," Hillman replied. "We feel that we have a right to hope and work along proper lines towards that end, and think we should be as free as we can be."

For the workers to aspire lawfully to attain to the possession and control of an industry is not merely correct, but laudable.

The highest Catholic ideal set before the workers is nothing less than this: that the workers should *privately* own the shares of their industries and should *cooperatively* manage them, so far as this may be feasible and justly attainable. Nothing in fact can be more antagonistic and deadly to Socialism or Bolshevism than such an ideal, just as nothing has more assuredly hastened the progress of these economically erroneous movements than individualistic and autocratic forms of capitalism.

THE INFECTION OF SOCIALISM

THAT such is not the understanding of a great proportion of those who would "put the organized working class in actual control of the system of production," is more than probable. Socialism has caused endless confusion in the minds of the working class, and our duty is precisely to point out what aspirations on the part of labor are legitimate and desirable, and which way ruin lies. There is no more dangerous class of society, on the other hand, than that which cries "Socialism!" and "Bolshevism!" at every expression of labor's desire to own and control the industries in which it is employed. All that we need insist upon is that none but perfectly legitimate and Christian means are employed.

What has been said is not, therefore, to be taken as a blind defense of all the aims and purposes of the leaders of the Amalgamated. In certain instances these are nothing else than international Socialism. This would appear clearly enough from statements made by Secretary Schlossberg, from the fondness shown for the red flag with its acquired significance, and from the closeness of the New York section, at least, of the Amalgamated with the Red international federation. Such indications are sufficient to account for a prudent fear on the part of employers. Socialism, in brief, is an element that casts confusion into the entire labor movement of the world today. The more reason, on our part, for carefully discriminating between what is true and what is false in all this welter. The great body of workers in the Amalgamated are probably little concerned with any ulterior purposes.

THE GREAT DANGER

THERE is finally one great danger to be noted. It was pointed out in the plain language of the plain man when Senator Kenyon asked President Hillman: had the public not been "soaked" by the increased cost of clothing? Taking the system of the impartial chairman on its own merits, great as these are, is there not reason to apprehend the possibilities that may develop for the consumer when employers and employed have come to a perfect national and international agreement in any particular industry. What is to prevent them from amicably satisfying each others' demands and charging the price to the ultimate purchaser, the helpless, unorganized public?

The medieval guildsmen, with an equal power in their hands, made use of a twofold control that admirably solved this difficulty. The first consisted in applying the fundamental principle of Christian economics, that they were always to consult the common good. The second was their practise of submitting their constitutions and regulations for approval to the official representatives of the people. Thus the interests of the public were never overlooked.

JOSEPH HUSSLEIN, S.J.

NOTE AND COMMENT

An Energetic and Successful Young Men's League

THE League of Catholic Youth and Young Men in Germany is now in existence for just a quarter of a century. In this time it has grown from 600 societies which formed its nucleus to 3,600 such groups with a total membership of 350,000. It publishes seven different journals and has a central bureau in which forty-five officials and employees are engaged. The League

is in fact today one of the largest Catholic organizations in Germany. This wonderful success has been accomplished as the result of great personal sacrifice for the Catholic cause. The purpose of the organization is to promote the religious and moral education of its members, and to further their social and civic development. It takes active part in matters of public interest that concern the spiritual welfare of the nation and its members are not seldom forced to show their courage against attacks of the non-Catholic elements. At the present moment this calls at times for no slight degree of heroism. With such an organization at work the Catholics of Germany may well look forward to brighter days. The success of the League is the more striking when we are told that the entire aggregate of the various revolutionary societies of young men in Germany is only 30,000 as compared with the full Catholic strength of 360,000 militant members promoting the interests of the Church among the people.

Catholic Church and Labor

UNDER the title "Catholic Church and Labor," the *Coast Banker* some time ago brought a passage from an article that had already successively appeared in the *Manufacturers' Record* and the *Rotarian*. It thus describes the workings of a Catholic labor organization:

Workers who are known to be faithful and devoted to their duties are admitted, and benefits accrue immediately. They are personally looked after by committees of the syndicates; fair wages are assured to them; they are freed from the oppression of hard masters; if they are sick, they receive medical comforts and their families are kept from want; if work does not come to them, the syndicate seeks and finds new employment; if they are in need, on proper evidence being shown, they are loaned money at low rates of interest.

On the other hand, there are obligations to be performed. The worker may not strike; his difficulties are presented to the syndicate and the trouble adjusted. The employer undertakes to submit to such intervention on employing a member of the syndicate, and this he is glad to do, because he knows that the underlying spirit of the association is that of honesty and justice; he is relieved from anxiety lest his industry be crippled by strikes; he has no fear of bombs and incendiarism when he engages a force of these men. He has guarantees on which he can rely, and he is willing enough to give guarantees in return.

As part of the machinery a bank has been organized, which is an integral part of the group of syndicates. The dues of the members are divided into two parts, one portion for paying the operating expenses of the syndicate and the other going into the bank as a deposit to the credit of the member. Small as it may be, it represents something laid up against the evil day when he can no longer work. Moreover, these deposits share pro rata with the stock in receiving dividends.

So from Spain, "the country that the civilized world considers far behind the times," comments the editor of the *Coast Banker*, the largest and most influential organ of the banking circles on the Pacific slope, "comes the report of what may be the most progressive development of the decade," while the editor of the *Manufacturers' Record* sees in this Catholic plan "almost limitless potentialities." As a powerful economic measure he considers it worth studying and watching, "without regard at all to the religious or moral side." Here, however, is precisely the vital error. Every system of social reform must ultimately be based upon religion if it is to be lastingly successful.

Religious Freedom and Secretary Denby

IT is reported that the American "authorities" in Haiti will devote whatever time they can spare from their task of suppressing free speech and introducing other un-American customs into the island, to the aid of American Protestant missionaries. According to the *New York Tribune* for June 14:

Secretary Denby pledged the support of the marine authorities in Haiti to the proposal of the Federal Council of Churches, to send a committee to Haiti with a view to establishing missions in that country. In a letter to Dr. E. O. Watson, of the Council, the naval secretary said that during his visit to Haiti, he did not meet a single missionary or church-worker from the United States, and he urged that missionary work be taken up there immediately.

As the proportion of Christians to non-Christians in Haiti is at least three times as large as it is in the United States, the Federal Council would turn its attention with greater profit to those Protestant sections of the United States where peonage, lynching, venereal disease, and illiteracy are the characteristics of the population. The Catholic Haitians neither wish nor need American Protestant missionaries. What they demand from the United States is not a crowd of "church-workers," supported by their oppressors, "the marine authorities," but simple, elemental justice, and the instant cessation of a reign of brutality which should cause every American to hang his head in shame. It may also be asked, and the question should not remain unanswered, "By what authority does the Secretary of the Navy take upon himself to urge that Protestant missionaries be sent immediately to proselyte in a Catholic country?" Has freedom of religious worship been destroyed, along with freedom of speech in Haiti? Or has the United States, acting through Secretary Denby, proscribed the Catholic Faith of the inhabitants, and established Protestantism, "supported by the marine 'authorities,'" as the official religion in Haiti?

England's "Reign of Terror"

ACCORDING to the *Catholic Herald of India*, on returning to his see in Australia Archbishop Clune, who tried in vain last Christmas to secure from Lloyd George a truce in the Irish war, made an address in which he describes as follows England's "reign of terror" in Ireland:

[The Coercion] act was passed ostensibly to extirpate what you read of in the papers as the "murder gang," but it was soon evident that the object named was not the whole, or the real, object, because its operation very soon showed that it was meant not only to stop the shedding of blood, but it was meant to stifle and strangle the national spirit of the country and to bludgeon the people into submission. I cannot describe for you this reign of terror. No man or woman who has not gone through it can form even an idea of what it has been to live under that regime during the last few months. It was my lot to spend a few weeks in my own native county, under the operation of this law, and I assure you here tonight that the life of no man or woman was safe in Ireland during that terrible time. The forces of law and order became the forces of disorder and anarchy. I say with regret and reluctance that every infamy perpetrated by Germany during its occupation of Belgium has been renewed, repeated, and in some cases exceeded in Ireland. And the very British papers that lashed the world to fury against Germany because of its frightfulness in Belgium were absolutely silent regarding similar things in Ireland, and refused to publish them. With the exception of three papers I read, you could hardly get a line descriptive of the horrors of the situation in Ireland. A correspondent of a paper who dared to expose the infamy that was going on was kept as much "on the run" as the heads of the Sinn Fein party. He dared not sleep in the same bed for two nights running, though an English journalist. He was hounded like a dog. The "Black and Tans" sought him. I cannot attempt to give you a description of what life was like in that unfortunate country. I cannot give it, because I don't think any words that I could say would describe the appalling horrors of the situation. Trial by jury altogether abolished, inquests abolished, why?—lest the light of public opinion might be thrown on the deeds of darkness and blood perpetrated by the forces of the Crown. If you have read this evening's paper you have read the charges brought by De Valera against the forces of the Crown. I am here as Archbishop, coming from the place, to tell you that I subscribe to every word of every charge brought against those forces by President De Valera.

His Grace asserted that as the negotiator of a truce he found

the Sinn Feiners "were not unreasonable and it is not their fault if blood-shedding is going on still." He is convinced that the determination of the Irish to achieve what for centuries they have been fighting for is as strong as ever. "Notwithstanding all that the people have suffered, their spirit is not broken." At a farewell banquet given in London to Archbishop Mannix last month, Bishop Fogarty said he was half glad his Grace had not visited Ireland, for he might not have returned from there. "Such," added the Bishop, "is the state of affairs over there at the present moment that no man going to bed at night knows whether his brains will not be blown out before morning in the interests of English civilization."

American Divorce Statistics

THIRTY-TWO American States have a divorce-rate higher than that of Japan. Such is the revelation made by the International Reform Bureau whose reports were recently issued. Owing to the long time taken in collating these data the present figures go back to the year 1916. In six counties, representing five different States, this national evil reached the almost incredible stage at which there were actually more divorces than marriages. In Pawnee County, Oklahoma, the proportion of divorces to marriages was one to 0.77; in Washoe, Nevada, one to 0.78; in Trinity, California, one to 0.85; in Rutherford, Tennessee, one to 0.87; in Union, Oregon, one to 0.87; and in Clackamas, Oregon, one to 0.92. South Carolina has the unique distinction of having no divorces on record, for the reason that the law does not permit them. The following is the comparative net divorce-rate by States for each 100,000 population:

(1) Nevada, 652; (2) Montana, 413; (3) Arizona, 358; (4) Oregon, 277; (5) Washington, 239; (6) California, 230; (7) New Hampshire, 227; (8) Indiana, 223; (9) Texas, 221; (10) Michigan, 221; (11) Arkansas, 220; (12) Missouri, 202; (13) Idaho, 196; (14) New Mexico, 191; (15) Wyoming, 186; (16) Illinois, 183; (17) Ohio, 176; (18) Rhode Island, 176; (19) Oklahoma, 170; (20) Iowa, 168; (21) Florida, 163; (22) Utah, 158; (23) Kansas, 155; (24) Vermont, 153; (25) Nebraska, 144; (26) Kentucky, 140; (27) Connecticut, 130; (28) Tennessee, 128; (29) Colorado, 128; (30) Louisiana, 115; (31) Delaware, 114; (32) Maine, 112; (33) Minnesota, 108; (34) Mississippi, 105; (35) Massachusetts, 101; (36) Alabama, 101; (37) South Dakota, 95; (38) Virginia, 92; (39) Wisconsin, 89; (40) Maryland, 87; (41) North Dakota, 75; (42) Pennsylvania, 74; (43) West Virginia, 69; (44) Georgia, 54; (45) New Jersey, 54; (46) New York, 44; (47) North Carolina, 30; (48) South Carolina, 0; District of Columbia, 15.

The ratio of divorces to marriage for the several States is:

(1) Nevada, 1:1.54; (2) Oregon, 1:2.52; (3) Washington, 1:4.01; (4) Idaho, 1:4.81; (5) Wyoming, 1:5.34; (6) Oklahoma, 1:5.40; (7) Montana, 1:5.46; (8) California, 1:5.54; (9) Arizona, 1:5.92; (10) Indiana, 1:5.94; (11) Texas, 1:6.36; (12) Missouri, 1:6.36; (13) New Hampshire, 1:6.40; (14) Arkansas, 1:6.56; (15) Iowa, 1:6.90; (16) Ohio, 1:6.91; (17) Kansas, 1:6.93; (18) Illinois, 1:7.26; (19) Michigan, 1:7.52; (20) Utah, 1:7.61; (21) Nebraska, 1:7.63; (22) Kentucky, 1:7.77; (23) Colorado, 1:8.63; (24) New Mexico, 1:8.66; (25) Florida, 1:8.73; (26) Rhode Island, 1:9.14; (27) Maine, 1:9.36; (28) South Dakota, 1:9.54; (29) Tennessee, 1:9.62; (30) Delaware, 1:9.70; (31) North Dakota, 1:10.24; (32) Wisconsin, 1:10.65; (33) Alabama, 1:11.13; (34) Virginia, 1:11.30; (35) Minnesota, 1:11.65; (36) Vermont, 1:12.59; (37) Mississippi, 1:12.63; (38) Louisiana, 1:13.43; (39) Pennsylvania, 1:14.46; (40) Massachusetts, 1:14.71; (41) Connecticut, 1:56.67; (42) West Virginia, 1:20.32; (43) Maryland, 1:20.35; (44) Georgia, 1:23.05; (45) New Jersey, 1:26.66; (46) New York, 1:29.81; (47) North Carolina, 1:39.14; (48) South Carolina, no divorces; District of Columbia, 1:91.34.

Judges, lawyers, sociologists and clergymen, we are told, have all been struck with consternation by these figures. We are but reaping the whirlwind where we have sown the storm. The Catholic Church alone has consistently and successfully combated this evil. The only key to the situation is her religious education.